

May 4, 2009



TRANSCRIPT

May 4, 2009

MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL

PRESENT

Councilmember Phil Andrews, President

Councilmember Roger Berliner, Vice President

Councilmember Marc Elrich

Councilmember Valerie Ervin

Councilmember Nancy Floreen

Councilmember Michael Knapp

Councilmember George Leventhal

Councilmember Duchy Trachtenberg

May 4 2009



1 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

2 You're gonna be in that position for a long, long time at this point.

3
4 TERESA DANIELL:

5 And I'm happy to be here.

6
7 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

8 Yeah. You might as well hang up?????. Mr. Counihan.

9
10 GENE COUNIHAN:

11 Just very briefly on behalf of the commissioners, I want to add to the Interim General--first
12 of all to your accolades for the Interim General Manager for her leadership, but I also want
13 to recognize the Council and express appreciation for the leadership that you've given to
14 help us to get to the point where we've gotten started at attacking some of our major
15 issues--that is, better and more comprehensive monitoring as well as replacement, but
16 indicating that you've played a key role, and we appreciate in getting us started, but we
17 still have miles to go, literally, and hard work to do, but we wouldn't be where we are
18 without the leadership that this Council has provided to date, and I want to recognize and
19 thank you for that.

20
21 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

22 That's always a very good beginning to any budget overview. Thank you, Mr. Counihan.
23 Um, I thought what I would do here, Keith, is summarize some key points in your memo,
24 and we'll see how much further detail the Councilmembers want. As usual, Keith has done
25 a terrific job in outlining the issues that the committee reviewed and that WSSC has
26 addressed in its proposed budget. In a nutshell, the committee recommends--and the
27 County Executive recommends fundamentally supporting WSSC's proposed budget with a
28 few tweaks here and there. This would end up with a 9% rate increase. The effect on the
29 average property owner is about \$4.47 a month. The total WSSC budget, the combined
30 operating capital, is 929.3 million. It is 1.3% over fiscal year '09. We would add in another,
31 I think, 4 million to that actual number, which reflects federal stimulus money. Not a big
32 chunk, but at least a drop in our bucket of unending needs. The operating budget for
33 WSSC is at about 588.2 million--a 5.8% increase. Water production under this budget will
34 be about 170 million gallons per day. They do not include any COLAs or incentive pay in
35 this particular budget, and I will direct your attention to page 10 of the packet, which has

May 4 2009



1 some of the highlights. It refers to the water production that they anticipate. A net increase
2 of 6 work-years across both the operating budget and the CIP. This includes 2.5 million for
3 12 miles of large diameter PCCP water main inspection and acoustic fiber optic monitoring
4 and 1.75 million for repairs identified during these inspections. Not much, but something.
5 This funds--really gets us going here--no, I'm being sarcastic. It funds 31 miles of water
6 main reconstruction, up from 27 miles in fiscal year '09. And as I recall, Glenn, that gets us
7 from the--we're at the what? 177-year plan?

8
9 GLENN ORLIN:

10 From about 204 miles of replacement cycle to about 174.

11
12 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

13 174 miles planned. So there you go. We're making some progress, not a lot. We spent
14 some time and have had a number of conversations with them. This year, obviously, with
15 the number of very politically evident water main breaks, we commend WSSC and its
16 coordination with all the agencies and communities involved. Both Montgomery and
17 Prince George's have been pretty hard hit by significant breaks in very difficult locations
18 with tremendous community impact. I mean, schools have had to be closed, hospital
19 services have been affected. Of course, transportation needs have been significant. We
20 had a dramatic rescue around Christmastime, which I believe ensured that the state
21 continued to fund its helicopter fleet, so you did that for the people of the state of
22 Maryland. But the issue of money is a continual issue for this agency, and we do believe
23 that they are addressing the environmental issues associated with their operations as well
24 as the community needs in delivering a clean and reliable source of water. We do have a
25 long way to go. We do not have what was proposed last year, which was the quote
26 unquote "ready to serve" charge, which was an additional charge to beef up our
27 infrastructure initiative, and so we will leave that, still, to another day. This is still a hefty
28 hike in water rates on the scale of things, and again, we really don't see any way around it.
29 Now, the question I don't know off the tip of my tongue is whether we will encounter a
30 disagreement with Prince George's on this subject on Thursday, right?

31
32 KEITH LEVCHENKO:

33 Based on our latest discussions with Prince George's staff, we are pretty close. There are
34 a couple of what I would call fairly marginal differences, but I think conceptually, we're very
35 close with their council now.

May 4 2009



1
2 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

3 OK. OK. So with that, that's my overview of the key issues. Mr. Knapp seems to have a
4 question.

5
6 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP?????:

7 He does.

8
9 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

10 Mr. Knapp.

11
12 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

13 Thank you, Madam President. I would echo the sentiments that you outlined at the
14 beginning as it relates to leadership of WSSC as well as the Commission itself. I thank
15 you very much. Your organization has been in the paper a lot, much of it through no fault
16 of what's going on on a day-to-day basis and what all of you and your employees do. The
17 question I have is, do you have a mechanism, or have you undertaken mechanisms, to
18 get a sense of how the organization's doing? How are the folks who are doing the job
19 every day getting along? Is your Office of Human Resources doing some type of internal
20 survey work? Are there activities under way just to kind of see--there's a lot of not positive
21 stuff out there, and at some point, people keep reading about their organization and go,
22 "Wow. I thought we were doing a good job." And just to make sure that the folks who are
23 doing the stuff on a day-to-day basis are actually recognized that they are doing a good
24 job and all the other stuff is superfluous and we appreciate them keep doing it.

25
26 TERESA DANIELL:

27 Thank you for asking that question. I would say the senior leaders and all of the leaders
28 within WSSC do make it one of our priorities to keep a communication plan alive and well
29 so our employees know what's going on and also understand that it's the day-to-day
30 operations that's the most important thing that we do to serve our communities, and I feel
31 confident that all of our employees know that. We also have an employee liaison who is
32 out and about on a regular basis, you know, I guess checking the pulse of morale, if you
33 will. I think that folks--our employees are committed. They understand the critical job that
34 they do. They're proud of it, and we're proud of them.

May 4 2009



1 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

2 Mm-hmm.

4 TERESA DANIELL:

5 So I'm confident that while of course reading negative things, I suppose, if you will, about
6 the agency you work for and that you're proud of can be a little frustrating and maybe a
7 little disappointing, but overall, I think that our employees know what they bring to the
8 communities and are committed to doing a good job, and so I'm confident in their abilities
9 and their morale in continuing to take care of, as I said, a critical public health and safety
10 need.

12 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

13 Very good. Because by all indications, they are the ones doing a great job and continue to
14 be doing it every day, and so please extend our thanks to them and keep up the good
15 work.

17 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

18 Thank you, Mr. Knapp.

20 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

21 Council Vice President Berliner.

23 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

24 Just a brief note that the Chair mentioned that is obviously important to the people in
25 District 1 as well as to all our constituents, which is the effort being made with respect to
26 the PCC pipe and the inspection with respect to that, and I have been advised that
27 basically we are doing as much as can be done at this moment in time and that you will
28 continue to make this a priority. Obviously we have had a history of these pipes bursting,
29 of which River Road being the most dramatic example, and it is essential that we monitor
30 those pipes so that we quote "hear" when there's some deterioration and therefore can
31 ensure that we don't have repeat disasters like River Road. And during the course of our
32 committee deliberations, you good folks have promised that this is a high priority for you
33 and that you have in fact allocated as much as you believe is prudent, as much as we can
34 do without shutting down parts of the system, and I accept your characterization of that
35 and look forward to your ongoing efforts in that regard. Thank you.

May 4 2009



1
2 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

3 Let me just note, Councilmember Berliner has been a very tireless advocate on this
4 particular point, and you will note that at the end of the packet that the committee certainly
5 agrees that the highest priority of work is this inspection initiative for us, the monitoring
6 and repair, and to the extent that we can find other resources to devote to that, we would
7 very much request that WSSC prioritize that kind of initiative as you work through your
8 many other obligations. So that is a key point for us. The reliability of public water, I think
9 we would all agree, is one of our fundamental responsibilities in public service. So with
10 that, I don't see that anyone else has any questions or comments at this point unless, Mr.
11 Leventhal, did you want to weigh in--I don't think so--on the committee recommendation?

12
13 COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

14 No. I want to thank the Chair of the T&E committee for her advocacy. She pays close
15 attention to everything going on at WSSC, and we certainly hope progress will be made
16 on the maintenance and infrastructure issues and appreciate Ms. Daniell, the work you're
17 doing. We always enjoy interfacing with you in committee and understand that it's been
18 turbulent at times, but we appreciate that you've provided consistency, and all of your
19 senior team, we appreciate the leadership that you've provided.

20
21 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

22 Yes, that's right, and I want to thank the Chair of the T&E committee as well for her careful
23 attention to all things WSSC in the last 6 1/2 years in her tenure as Chair, and the other
24 committee members as well have worked on this hard, also. Thank you for your
25 leadership in a challenging time as an interim leader, and I agree very much with what
26 Councilmember Knapp said about the good work that's being done every day on the
27 ground by WSSC employees to keep the system functioning very well. And when we turn
28 on the spigot, we know we get clean water coming out of it, and that's something that we
29 sometimes take for granted, but many people can't. So we thank you for that.

30
31 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

32 Thank you. And with that, Keith, you want to hit the high points? I don't think we need to
33 spend a lot of time on the details.

34
35 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

May 4 2009



1 This--why don't we see--is there anything you want to add, Keith, that has not been
2 mentioned?

3
4 KEITH LEVCHENKO:

5 I would just note that the committee's recommendations on the front page of the packet.
6 The first 3 bullet items are essentially what the Executive recommended as well in terms
7 of changes to the WSSC proposed budget. As Mr. Berliner mentioned, there were some
8 additional dollars recommended by the executive and recommended by the Council to
9 basically maximize the inspection, monitoring, and repair of the PCCP water main
10 infrastructure. This would basically get us to what is expected to be the maximum. It may
11 in fact be more than we can do, depending on where the system is that we're working on
12 and how much can be taken out of service. So any excess dollars that are there that can't
13 be used feasibly for the inspection, we suggest in the packet they be used for water main
14 reconstruction, which is obviously another long-term area of concern. So that's just one
15 little wrinkle on top of the Executive recommendation. And I also note in the packet that--
16 how those additional dollars would be funded within the 9% rate increase. There are some
17 recommendations to use some additional reconstruction debt service offset. Without
18 getting into the details of that, it's a fund that WSSC has that is dwindling over time, but
19 there are some dollars in it that we use each year as part of the operating budget process
20 at spending affordability, and that can be ramped up slightly this year to cover that. And
21 there's also some excess fund balance that we're projecting that can cover that, so we can
22 accommodate these additional items within the 9% increase that was recommended by
23 WSSC. But with that, we'll just take any questions, any specific questions
24 Councilmembers have on any items. That was it from our end.

25
26 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

27 Thank you. There are no questions about the budget, so with that, Council is accepting
28 the committee recommendations, and thank you to everyone at the table for your hard
29 work. Good to see you, Mr. Counihan. Please relay our thanks to your colleagues as well,
30 and thank you, everybody, for your continued hard work on this important matter.

31
32 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

33 And let me just note, as I alluded to earlier, this is a matter for our bi-county meeting on
34 Thursday, correct?

May 4 2009



1 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
2 Yes.
3
4 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:
5 Over at the WSSC?
6
7 KEITH LEVCHENKO:
8 The WSSC on Thursday, and--
9
10 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:
11 One of those usually nice lengthy meetings.
12
13 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
14 Long drive but short meeting.
15
16 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:
17 So we will see you soon.
18
19 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
20 All right.
21
22 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:
23 Thank you very much.
24
25 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
26 Thank you. All right. We're now going to go on to budgets--the Montgomery County--the
27 Montgomery College budget, and I will turn to the Chair of the Council's Education
28 committee, Councilmember Ervin for a report.
29
30 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:
31 Thank you very much. Good morning. We're being joined at the table right now by
32 President Brian Johnson, and I'll ask him to introduce his colleagues today.
33
34 BRIAN JOHNSON:

May 4 2009



1 Good morning, President Andrews, Chairwoman Ervin, members of the Council. I
2 appreciate the opportunity to be with you and to make a few comments on behalf of
3 Montgomery College. Before doing so, I'd like to introduce the team that's assembled
4 here, starting with, to my left, our trustee, Gene Counihan; to my right, Vice President for
5 Administrative and Fiscal Affairs, Marshall Moore. To his right, our Interim Academic Vice
6 President for Planning and Research, Kathy Wessman, and to her right is Donna
7 Diamond, who is our Budget Manager, and to the far right at the table, Mr. David Capp,
8 who is our Associate Vice President for Facilities. We greatly appreciate the historic
9 support that this Council has provided for Montgomery College, and it has been, I think,
10 support well-placed. The college is experiencing, as you know, record enrollment. We're in
11 the mark of 60,000 students per year that we serve. We're serving a record number of
12 students who are enrolled in credit classes. That number is approaching 25,000 per
13 annum, which is an astronomically high number. We continue to increase in enrollments
14 as the county suffers economically, and that is a national trend, that when the economy
15 experiences a downturn, enrollments-- particularly in community colleges--increase. We
16 have, in addition to those enrollments, seen an increase in the number of students who
17 are applying for financial aid. We had an increase of about 8,200 financial aid applications
18 this year alone, which represents a 20% increase over, again, an historically high number.
19 So our hope this morning is that you would consider 3 particular points. One, that
20 Montgomery College is a very solid and responsible steward of taxpayer dollars. We tend
21 to be a solution and an aid to the economy, particularly during this tough time. Secondly,
22 County Executive Ike Leggett's original budget recommendations assumed that we would
23 receive a 5% increase in state funding, and we did not. We received a 2.7% increase in
24 state funding, which leaves the college with a budget gap of \$1 million. And then finally,
25 we're here to offer support for the Education Committee's recommendation to add \$1
26 million to the reconciliation list that would in fact support the college. We greatly
27 appreciate your historic support, and we ask that that support continue. Thank you.

28
29 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

30 Thank you very much. We really appreciate the great work of the team you have here, but
31 the team also assembled at the college, who teach our young people every single day. As
32 you know, I have a story about my own son, who attended Montgomery College, who's
33 now a senior at Maryland, and so we know that the college really does change lives, and
34 so your commitment here is so extraordinary, and we really appreciate all the hard work
35 that the college has done to bring its budget in line to where we are right now, and so

May 4 2009



1 we're gonna--with the work of Chuck Sherer putting together a really great packet, talk
2 about what the committee has agreed on regarding your budget. I know that the college
3 has instituted an aggressive savings plan in FY '09 and requested only a 3% increase in
4 funding for FY '10, and so I'm going to also congratulate you. We hear a lot about MCPS
5 and its great--what its employees did by taking that COLA reduction, but your employees
6 also did the same, and so we want to acknowledge your employees for their sacrifice as
7 well. So I'm gonna really quickly walk through the packet, Chuck, and when we have some
8 questions, we'll stop and ask you for your assistance, starting with the Education
9 Committee recommendation, which is to approve the college's request with the following
10 reductions for the current fund based on the lack of revenues:

11 number one, reduce the request by \$1.2 million and do not prefund in FY '10 any of the
12 health costs for retired employees, referred to as OPEB. Two, reduce the request by \$1
13 million for such items as positions and expenses associated with opening new facilities.
14 The committee recommendation was to put on the reconciliation list in 4 increments of
15 \$250,000 each. The committee noted also that the College eliminated 10 vacant positions
16 in its operating budget and added two positions to the capital budget for IT and reduced
17 programs by \$0.5 million. We also noted that the Board of Trustees has been forced to
18 increase tuition, which is very troubling for a community college, especially a community
19 college of the size of Montgomery College. And we know that the students who really
20 need to access Montgomery College are going to have to do it by paying over \$100 now in
21 credit hour. It's going from \$99 to \$102, and to give that some context, I noted--I went
22 online and looked at Prince George's County per credit hour. Theirs is \$96. They were
23 able to keep it under 100. And Northern Virginia Community College per credit hour is
24 \$90. And so, I know you've done all that you can. I really compliment the Board of
25 Trustees for all the years that they've kept the cost of tuition down, but we are in
26 extraordinary times now, and so this has created a situation where our students are going
27 to have to pay more than \$100 per credit hour. Moving on... I guess, Chuck, you can--
28 starting on page 2, if you could discuss the FY09 Budget Savings Plan and the FY10
29 operating budget request throughout the rest of the packet I'd appreciate that.

30
31 CHARLES SHERER:

32 I'll just note the FY09 Budget Savings Plan, that the college had committed to reducing its
33 budget by \$2.1 million, and the college thinks they're on target to do that. With regard to
34 FY10 budget request, you had noted that the college request's was only for a 3% increase
35 in tax-supported funds, and that was based on a projected increase in enrollment of 0.3%,

May 4 2009



1 compensation cost for existing employees, and the cost of operating new facilities. The --
2 let's see. I noted that the spending affordability guidelines for the college was greater than
3 the College's request, so no reduction was required for spending affordability purposes.
4 Then the committee talked about the Executive's March 15 recommendation, which was to
5 reduce the college's budget by \$500,000, and that would--that entire reduction would have
6 been for the additional increase of prefunding OPEB. Then the Executive's April 20 budget
7 amendment made an additional reduction to the college of \$700,000, based on the actual
8 amount of state aid that the General Assembly approved. And so the college's total budget
9 reduction, under the Executive's recommendation, is \$1.2 million, and all of that was for
10 prefunding of OPEB. The Executive's recommendation included a number of components
11 --one, the \$1.2 million reduction in expenditures I just mentioned would reduce the county
12 contribution by \$2.6 million, an increase of state aid of \$858,000 compared to what the
13 Executive had assumed in his March budget. I stated-- was more than the college
14 assumed but less than the Executive assumed, so I stated that wrong. He would reduce
15 investment income \$412,000 to reflect lower interest rates, and finally, he recommended
16 increasing the fund balance at the beginning of FY10 and increase the use of that fund
17 balance by that amount. The college did not want to accept an increase in use of fund
18 balance, and the committee agreed, and therefore it was necessary to further reduce the
19 college's budget by a million dollars because there was no revenues to support it. And
20 that's how the committee ended up with an additional reduction of \$1 million and put that
21 \$1 million on the reconciliation list in four increments of \$250,000. I believe that covers the
22 main points that the committee had discussed.

23
24 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

25 Well, I will turn over to my colleagues on the Education Committee to see if there's any
26 comments. Council President?

27
28 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

29 You did a very good job, and so did staff. I'm going to turn to Councilmember Knapp for
30 any comments.

31
32 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

33 Thank you, Mr. President. Thank the chair for her leadership in the area of education.
34 Clearly, it's an area about which you feel very passionately, and I know that both MCPS
35 and Montgomery College interact with her, and that that passion comes through on a

May 4 2009



1 regular basis, and so I thank the chair, and I thank the President and the leadership team
2 for the advocacy that you bring. Just a couple of questions. We talked about the per credit
3 hour piece and how you've had to raise fees, and I just want to kind of--to the extent that
4 anyone is listening to us out there on TV--what does that mean to a student who is
5 actually going to school full --taking a full load each semester? How much does that now
6 cost a person, to go to school at Montgomery College?

7
8 UNKNOWN SPEAKER?????:

9 Close to \$4,100.

10
11 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

12 Per semester?

13
14 UNKNOWN SPEAKER?????:

15 Semester-- no, no, for the year, based on 15 credits per semester.

16
17 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

18 OK. So it's \$4,100. I think that's important, just to understand --just to get that number out
19 there. I think it's also an important point to recognize that--and I think this has been
20 important--that the state legislature and the governor have worked very hard over the last
21 few years to try to and make sure that the tuition at the university system has remained
22 constant and those fees have not increased, but unfortunately, when we look at our
23 community college system, which is where we know most of our people are now
24 accessing the education--higher education, those fees have not been held with the same
25 regard. And so I think it's important to kind of understand it's great that we've been able to
26 do at the state university system. It is unfortunate, however, that that has not translated
27 into recognition to understanding the role the community colleges play and that we're
28 actually creating a higher bar for--in a place where there's more and greater need. And so
29 I think that's just an important point to observe. I think we as a community need to
30 continue to thank our legislature and our governor for what they've done on the one side,
31 but kind of point out the piece that we're making it harder for people who need it most, and
32 I think that's a critical piece that's been neglected. And then just one issue for Mr. Farber.
33 The recommendation has come across, and we've kind of accepted it in a lot of our
34 packets as it relates to the OPEB requirement and pushing--basically not making any of
35 those payments this coming year. And as we will recall, two of three years ago, we had a

May 4 2009



1 very animated and lively conversation as to what the implications of that would be for the
2 bond rating--for the bond agencies, the rating houses, and what that would-- what that
3 could mean to us. Now, obviously the economics of the situation have changed, but as we
4 go through this over the course of the next two weeks, I'd like to get a sense of, have we
5 had feedback from any of our bond rating agencies as to what they--just any
6 conversations as to what this pretty significant step will mean before we all kind of jump off
7 the cliff and say it's OK for us to do it, and to the extent that there are other jurisdictions
8 that have taken--that are similarly rated to Montgomery County that have taken similar
9 steps. If we could have some of that feedback or any information anyone may have on
10 that, that would be very helpful. STEPHEN FARBER:

11 Yes. We'll be happy to provide that. I think your point is a good one. Basically, the
12 Executive's recommendation is that of the \$66 million in OPEB funding for all agencies
13 that was to have been included for Fiscal '10, all that remains is \$12 million for MCPS, and
14 for the college, for Park and Planning and County government, the OPEB has been
15 zeroed out. That occurred, as Mr. Sherer said, in the April 20 budget amendment from the
16 Executive to take a count of the final reductions in state aid. But your question is a good
17 one. We've discussed this with our colleagues across the street. It is true this year that
18 many jurisdictions find themselves in the same position, and the rating agencies, it is
19 widely believed, understand that this is a unique year and hopefully are prepared to cut
20 slack in that regard. But the \$66 million that we were going to have for Fiscal 10--as you
21 point out, two years ago, the schedule for Fiscal 10 called for 110 million, and we relaxed
22 it from a five-year phase-in to an eight-year. So this is something we definitely have to
23 stay on top of because these do represent prefunding commitments for promises that we
24 have made to the employees of all agencies, and they're dead serious.

25
26 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

27 Well, and I know the rating trip is coming up soon--within the next few weeks, and that will
28 be important to have that dialogue, but I know that during the course of the conversation
29 there last year, there is ongoing dialogue throughout the course of the year with the rating
30 agencies, and I think it would just be important to understand what communication has
31 occurred to this point just so we have some understanding before we all raise our hands
32 and vote on what you've recognized is a pretty significant departure from where we were--
33 albeit warranted, but nevertheless, we ought to understand what the communications
34 have been. STEPHEN FARBER:

35 We'll follow up on that.

May 4 2009



COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

Thank you.

COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

I think that's an excellent point because last week, several of us went to Baltimore to meet with State Board of Education on the Maintenance of Effort issue. We're still waiting to hear back whether or not that waiver was--was approved, which brings me to my next question to the college-- what's the contingency plan going to be if in fact Montgomery County does not receive \$79 million in waiver money? When Mike--when Mike asked a question about OPEB, there's very few places to go. You've already raised tuition. You've already cut staffing. Your employees didn't get their COLA. There is not much left, as far as I can tell, to cut. So if we receive word in the next week and a half or so that the waiver was not requested, all of the agencies are going to have to go back to the drawing board. I'm wondering what your plan is.

BRIAN JOHNSON:

Madam chair, members of the Council, we would certainly be in a very tough position, and given that we have raised tuition--in the minds of some, beyond affordability for our students --and given that we have begun to look at cuts to programs, we'd have to return to that same strategy. We don't have many places to go. An additional increase in tuition would be detrimental at a time when we're turning away north of 3,000 students per semester, and again, at a time when the increase in financial aid applications is upwards of 20%. We would be forced, I think, to look at programming, some of the academic and support programs that are available for students, and, of course, that would jeopardize, in some ways, the level of quality that we're known for. We really don't have a number of options on the table.

GENE COUNIHAN:

Madam Chairman, if I may?

COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

Sure.

GENE COUNIHAN:

May 4 2009



1 Just to--just to support the president's comments, you know, we're about affordability and
2 accessibility. This Council has played a key role over the 12 years that I've been a trustee
3 at the college helping to move the college to being the first choice for many of our high-
4 school graduates. That is based on both affordability, accessibility, as well as quality.
5 When the money is not there, we either make decisions that impact quality, or we turn to
6 tuition. They're the only two--any cuts, we compromise the quality of the programs. We
7 don't ever want to do that. Any tuition increase means we are--our mission, our main
8 mission--affordability and accessibility--is compromised. So it is a very difficult choice that
9 we must face when the moneys are not there, and neither of which is at all appealing or
10 attractive to us. Fortunately, this Council has, over the 12 years that I've been a trustee,
11 has been so vital and so critical in helping us to maintain affordability, accessibility, and
12 quality programs. And I just have to say, as sort of my last time at the table on a budget
13 for the college that I am personally so grateful for the work that you guys have done on
14 behalf of the--and the leadership you've provided to enable us to become the first choice
15 for so many students, as President Johnson indicated-- over 25,000 credit students,
16 60,000 overall--just unprecedented growth, and--and doing that with quality programs, and
17 we thank you.

18
19 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

20 Thank you very much.

21
22 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

23 All right. Well, thank you, Chair Ervin, on the operating budget, and thanks--thank you.
24 Montgomery College is an exceptional community college, and it plays an absolutely
25 crucial role in our community in providing affordable education for a huge number of our
26 residents. And I do want to, on behalf of the Council, recognize the exceptional leadership
27 over the years of Gene Counihan, who, although he doesn't wear hats, is a man of many
28 of them. Thank you. And I know you'll continue to do good in your other capacities, as
29 well, and continue, I know, to be a strong supporter of the college. Councilmember
30 Leventhal.

31
32 COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

33 Yeah, I was just going to say about Gene Counihan, I don't think there's any role for him
34 with the next item or the item after next, which is public libraries, but maybe we could
35 make him an honorary member of the Board of --Friends of the Library or the Board of

May 4 2009



1 Library Trustees, just --just so he could stick around, because we've got the benefit of his
2 expertise on WSSC and the college now, and it seems a shame to let him leave.

3
4 GENE COUNIHAN:

5 Actually, my wife would be a better qualified for that role than I would.

6
7 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

8 He's got pretty close connections there, too. So, thank you, Gene.

9
10 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

11 Thank you very much. We're going to move on, then, to the capital budget. On the capital
12 side, the college worked with the Executive branch and the Education Committee to
13 reduce funding requests to help the County resolve its fiscal problems. So projects begin
14 at the bottom of page one, and if Chuck could walk us through, there are, on the bottom--
15 on page 3, seven projects altogether, if you wanted to walk us through those.

16
17 CHARLES SHERER:

18 Yes, ma'am. I'll start with the Bioscience Education Center, and that was a project where
19 there were two issues that the committee discussed. One was where should the new
20 access road be, and the Education Committee and the PHED Committee met jointly on
21 April 24 to discuss the alignment for the road, and they agreed with the alignment referred
22 to as West Alternative 2, and there's a map on circle 2A that shows where that road will
23 go, and the college agrees with that alignment, and there's a press release from the
24 college to that effect in the packet, on page 2B. With regard to state aid, the state is
25 having their fiscal problems this year, as well, and unlike in prior years, the state is making
26 its appropriation for the state aid for this project in two parts-- one in FY10 and one in
27 FY11. In prior years, the state would have appropriated the entire amount in FY10, but as
28 I say, they're doing it in FY--in FY10 and in FY11, so they're spreading their appropriation
29 over two years. So that was a bit of an issue for all of us because we've never had this
30 issue before. Normally, as I say, we've had the whole appropriation when we make the
31 appropriation, and the way the committee decided to handle this was to approve the
32 project as proposed--and the PDF is on circle 1 and 2, and on circle 2, it shows that the
33 state aid will be spread over the two years, and as long as the state makes this
34 appropriation next year, then there's no problem for the County. If the state were
35 somehow not able to make its appropriation for FY11, then the County would be forced, I

May 4 2009



1 think, to provide the additional \$16 million because the alternative would be, you'd have a
2 building which is partially unfinished. You'd have a big hole in the ground, foundation laid,
3 some girders, and you couldn't stop it there, so the County would have to come up with
4 the additional \$16 million. That's just a risk I note, but we're assuming the state will come
5 through with what they said they would do, and this additional \$16 million is supposedly
6 preauthorized by the state. So that was the issue with regard to the Bioscience state--
7 Education Center state aid. The other six projects were just a matter of making slight
8 reductions in FY10 for current revenue funding so that the current revenue could be used
9 elsewhere to fund the operating budget, and in the spirit of cooperation, the college
10 agreed to manage these projects with the lower appropriation, and-- so there was no issue
11 there for the other six projects.

12
13 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

14 Very good. Thank you very much, Chuck. I'll turn it over to Councilmember Knapp.

15
16 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

17 Thanks. I apologize. I'm usually not the most verbose person up here, but today appears
18 to be my day, so... I just wanted to thank the college, thank Park and Planning, thank
19 Glenn Orlin, and thank the committee and the T&E Committee for consideration of the
20 access road for the-- associated with the Bioscience Education Center on the
21 Germantown campus. That has been a long and difficult conversation for all of the
22 organizations involved, and I think through continued advocacy and willingness to work
23 together, the outcome that we have before us is a very, very good one and gets the issues
24 raised by Park and Planning in the draft Germantown Master Plan and the issues raised
25 by the college for its ability to continue to grow and expand and do what it needs to do on
26 that site have both been accommodated, and I thank the Council and the committees for
27 their efforts to work with everyone to get that done. And so I just wanted to commend you
28 for your efforts, and your colleagues at Park and Planning, as well. It was arduous, but we
29 got there.

30
31 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

32 Council President, that is our recommendation.

33
34 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

May 4 2009



1 Very good, and thank you very much. There are no other questions or comments, so the
2 committee recommendation is accepted.

3
4 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

5 Thank you.

6
7 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

8 And thank you, Chair Ervin.

9
10 BRIAN JOHNSON:

11 Madam chair, with your permission, I would like to thank Councilmember Knapp also for
12 his guidance in helping us to reach the necessary compromises on that recommended
13 road in Germantown. We appreciate the spirit of collaboration that this County directs to
14 its agencies, and we are growing as we go. Madam chair, a great sense of gratitude
15 should be extended to you also for your staunch advocacy on behalf of the college, and
16 we appreciate that you're out there carrying our message. And to all of the Council, we
17 say thank you.

18
19 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

20 Thank you, President Johnson. And thank you all. We're now going to move on to the
21 libraries budget, and I will turn to the chair of the Health and Human Services Committee,
22 George Leventhal, for the committee's report.

23
24 COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

25 Thank you, Mr. President, and we're going to have Essie McGuire and Leslie Rubin join
26 us, and I want to thank them for their good work on the packet. The Health and Human
27 Services Committee approved the County Executive's budget recommendations for the
28 Department of Public Libraries. However, at--at our request, staff did develop some non-
29 recommended reductions-- we didn't even put them on the non-recommended reductions
30 list, but there are potential opportunities for budget reductions that we don't want to take,
31 and we'll get to those in just a moment. But what--the committee's recommendation that
32 comes now before the Council is, precisely as the Executive recommended, a total of
33 \$37,921,690, which is a decrease, from the FY09 approved level, of \$2,483,440. That's a
34 6.1% reduction. This is an elimination of 53 positions and 38.3 work years. There are two
35 live bodies being let go, 51 positions being eliminated, but I do want to point out that when

May 4 2009



1 you have a position available to be filled, you're able to manage your workload in a very
2 different way than once the position has been eliminated, and I think it's very, very
3 important in the Library Department and throughout County government to acknowledge
4 the real workload strain that's being caused by the 400 elimination of jobs in the County
5 Executive's budget. We have had some dialogue about, you know, is everyone feeling the
6 pain, is everyone making the sacrifice, are County employees feeling the pain, are County
7 employees making the sacrifice? When you eliminate the flexibility to add positions and
8 distribute workload, and when you eliminate actual employees --in this case, two live
9 bodies in the department and 51 positions being eliminated--of course, for those
10 individuals who are losing their jobs, that's a significant sacrifice. But for those individuals
11 who keep their jobs, there's also significant sacrifice, because they don't--the public's
12 expectation of service remains the same. The hours remain the same. When people show
13 up at the library, they want a prompt response if they have a question --request for
14 information or if they want to put a book on hold or they don't want to stand in a long line
15 for checkout because there's lack of staff. Of course, we've implemented some of those
16 checkout machines to assist there. But the point is, the workload strain is significant, and
17 as we look at the Public Library Department and as we look throughout County
18 government, our employees are sharing in the pain of this budget. Those who remain are
19 going to have a significant workload burden, and I think it's very important that we
20 continue to acknowledge that. So, the--the top reduction-- of course, we identified the
21 elimination of positions. The top reduction is in materials collection, a reduction from FY09
22 of \$612,520. We discussed with the department how it's trying to use information
23 technology to make up for some of the hardcopy materials that it will not be purchasing.
24 There will be journals and periodicals, new books that it will not be purchasing, and we
25 hope the Library Department will be creative in its use of electronic media. Of course,
26 some of the electronic media requires subscriptions, as well. We need journal
27 subscriptions, database subscriptions, and so a cut in materials collection is significant,
28 and it will be felt by library patrons. We have, as I mentioned, no cuts to library hours. The
29 staff suggested-- why don't we let the staff go to the bottom of page 4 and identify its
30 proposal on further reductions in materials. This was not adopted by the committee, but if
31 need be, as Chairwoman Ervin said with respect to the Maintenance of Effort waiver, we
32 may be right back here trying to make additional cuts, and so, although we are not
33 recommending any cuts to the library budget, the staff did a good job of saying, "Well, if
34 you absolutely have to--and we're not suggesting it--here are some areas where they

May 4 2009



1 could be taken." So with respect to materials collection, Essie, maybe you could address
2 that one.

3
4 **ESSIE McGUIRE:**

5 Certainly. As you mentioned, Mr. Leventhal, staff did identify that the materials budget
6 could be an additional area for Council reductions if necessary due to fiscal constraints.
7 Although clearly this does have an impact on the system and on customer satisfaction,
8 potentially, and on materials, there would not be staff affected additionally by such a
9 reduction. The chart that you see in your packet on page 4 shows a brief 10-year trend for
10 the library materials budget. Although the Executive's FY10 recommended level is less
11 than 10 years ago, it would not be the lowest point in this 10-year period, and the Council
12 could consider increments of \$100,000 of reductions--again, if necessary--in this area.

13
14 **COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:**

15 OK. Positions, on page 5, I already addressed in the overview. On page 6, this is just a
16 chart that--that explains which branches have staff reduced. Total staffing is lower than it
17 was in FY05. The ability to hire substitutes is being reduced significantly, by 28%. And the
18 committee did not recommend any staff reductions above the very significant staff
19 reductions recommended by the County Executive. We did discuss with the employee
20 organization, MCGEO, that represents library employees, some of their suggestions. They
21 were very concerned about workload. They recommended reductions in hours, but their
22 recommendation for reductions in hours would not result in the elimination of any
23 additional staff. They were very concerned that the workload should be spread more fairly
24 with existing staff. We did not do that. We do acknowledge the workload burden on staff,
25 as I already discussed, and MCGEO also had some suggestions for raising additional
26 revenues. We're not proposing those at this time because they would take some work and
27 effort and might not be ready by July 1. One of the proposals was that patrons might be
28 charged a fee of perhaps 50 cents for putting books on hold. That was not acted upon by
29 the committee. We certainly don't want to have a staff cost that would exceed 50 cents in
30 order to get revenue of 50 cents, but the department said it would look at that and get
31 back to us. There were also suggestions regarding sales of book bags and other novelty
32 items and souvenirs, and those are being taken seriously by the department, and the
33 department will continue to review what makes sense--again, in terms of staff time. If
34 you're operating a retail outlet in the library, that's a requirement on staff that may distract
35 from the ability to serve library patrons for free, and we do have a free library system, but

May 4 2009



1 we did take the suggestions under advisement, and the department will continue to work
2 with us on that. And then regarding library hours, we--in FY04, library hours were
3 significantly reduced, and then--then they were restored in FY05 when the economy
4 picked up. It is possible that if we, again, don't get the Maintenance of Effort waiver, we
5 might need to look at some reductions in library hours. We are not proposing that at this
6 time, but perhaps Essie could go ahead-- Essie did a--Essie and Leslie together did a very
7 comprehensive analysis of the level of usage at the different branches, and if we were to
8 prioritize cuts, which the committee did not recommend, how might those be taken. And
9 so I see that some Councilmembers have questions on library hours. I'll pause now--no?

10
11 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:
12 Just when you're done. Not yet.

13
14 COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:
15 OK. OK. Does--well, it's up to the Council President if you want to call on colleagues first,
16 or if you want to let Essie and Leslie explain the library hours proposal first.

17
18 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
19 Yeah. Let's have them go through it first.

20
21 COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:
22 OK.

23
24 LESLIE RUBIN:
25 Thank you. We took a look at weekday hours to see when there was lowest levels of
26 circulation. We identified Wednesday morning as a possibility, with--we also then received
27 scheduling information from the libraries to see what level of hours they schedule during
28 the week, and we took a look at the FY10 proposed complement for the libraries. And for
29 a variety of library branches, on page 12 of the packet, we compared the FY10
30 complement and the available hours compared to the scheduled hours during the week,
31 and we looked at a difference, if you reduced Wednesday morning staff hours by four
32 hours, which would result in closing most of the library branches for only three hours, we
33 identified a potential reduction per library of half a work year. And we looked at the cost of
34 Library Assistant 1 positions, because it's the most numerous position in the library, and
35 identified you could save on average \$28,000 per library if you eliminated a half work year

May 4 2009



1 position per library. So you could do that for one library, you could do it for 20 libraries,
2 anywhere in between.

3
4 ESSIE McGUIRE:

5 Just a couple of quick notes about this the recommendation. Again, the analysis compares
6 the current--

7
8 COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

9 Not a recommendation.

10
11 ESSIE McGUIRE:

12 I'm sorry. Thank you.

13
14 COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

15 Proposal.

16
17 ESSIE McGUIRE:

18 Thank you. This analysis prepares--compares the current scheduling with the proposed
19 FY10 complement, and it's important to note that, as Mr. Leventhal spoke to, the libraries
20 have been operating below their current complement, and so in no way does this schedule
21 reflect sort of ideal staffing or what the libraries might like to do if they had a fuller
22 complement. So in that respect, just to give a little context to the table on page 12. In
23 addition, I just wanted to note that this--we feel that this reduction would be fairly
24 conservative but also could be multiplied across the branches and adjusted per branch as
25 the Council needed to--again, if there are fiscal restraints that required that action. We sort
26 of figured it at a basic reduction of four hours of staff time that would be necessarily
27 implemented by the Executive branch. However, they needed to adapt it for their particular
28 situation.

29
30 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

31 Thank you for the analysis, and Councilmember Knapp does have-- not yet? OK. All right.
32 Councilmember Leventhal.

33
34 COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

May 4 2009



1 OK. And then, so, finally, on the operating budget, in a similar vein as the discussion on
2 library hours, staff was asked, could we achieve savings by closing one or more library
3 branches for one or more years? Again, the committee did not recommend that, but it's
4 important that--that this discussion take place, as it is now, in public, and if indeed we
5 have to make some very undesirable choices, we've laid them out for the public, even
6 though we are not at this time recommending any such further cuts below the County
7 Executive's budget. So if Essie and Leslie at this time could discuss the option of closing
8 one or more branches.

9
10 ESSIE McGUIRE:

11 Certainly. This option would yield a much larger savings, as the action would then reduce
12 the entire cost of operating that library branch, which does range between--we found that
13 most of the branches ranged in personnel budgets from 875,000 to \$1.3 million. There
14 were some larger and some--one much smaller. That action, again, would reduce the
15 entire complement for the year and achieve a much larger one-year savings. It's important
16 to note, however, that there are many logistical and operational obstacles or challenges
17 that would be present with this option. Certainly reinvesting to reopen the library would be
18 a significant cost, as would at that point some effort be required to update the materials
19 and prepare the library again for reopening, in addition to the impact on the community.

20
21 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

22 OK.

23
24 COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

25 OK. So that concludes the committee's discussion of the libraries' operating budget. I
26 understand some of my colleagues have questions.

27
28 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

29 Thank you, Councilmember Leventhal. Well, just before I turn to Councilmember Knapp, I
30 want to indicate that this is important work being done by the committees and by the staff
31 to identify potential additional reductions. If we have to go there, we want to have some
32 work done, which is what has been done and described as alternatives if things get worse,
33 if we don't get the full waiver from the state or--or less than that. So it's good to have some
34 of this out there and already analyzed. I'll turn now to Councilmember Knapp.

May 4 2009



1 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

2 Thank you, Mr. President, and I thank the chair, who is obviously a very, very strong and
3 staunch advocate for the libraries, and I know it was not easy for you to ask for even a
4 discussion of these options in the committee, and so I appreciate yours and the
5 committee's discussion of these, and staff efforts, because it's never fun to have the
6 dialogue, and unfortunately around here, sometimes when things get in writing, that
7 means of course you are proposing something and you like something less than you did
8 otherwise, and we all know that's not the case, and so I appreciate you very much putting
9 uncomfortable points for discussion on the table so that we can analyze them if we need
10 to later. Couple of questions. One, this is our first County department that we're looking at
11 in this, and I just wanted to get a sense of if you have a good idea of how many folks
12 would be eligible--are eligible for retirement under the RIP if things were to go forward? I
13 mean, obviously, we don't know who will choose to move forward, but how many folks do
14 you have that are eligible in the library that could be?

15
16 PARKER HAMILTON:

17 I think we have a list that had about--around 50 folks on that list that might be eligible. 50
18 to 60.

19
20 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

21 So there are 50 to 60 people from libraries who may be eligible to retire. And during last
22 year-- I mean, what kind of experience did you have last year with how many who were
23 eligible versus how many actually took retirement?

24
25 PARKER HAMILTON:

26 Again, we had about 50, and I think about 25 folks took the retirement.

27
28 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

29 So about 50 were eligible.

30
31 ERIK CARZON:

32 21 took the Retirement Incentive Program. The list--I think it was actually almost 90.

33
34 PARKER HAMILTON:

35 It was 90?

May 4 2009



1
2 ERIK CARZON:

3 It was almost 90, and some of those people are on this second list.
4

5 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

6 On the same, sure. And so what happens if we get half of those people? If half of those
7 people--you know, if you end up with 21-25 folks that retire again this year, how do we--
8 how do we move forward from that, given the fact that you are working at a greatly
9 reduced level already?
10

11 PARKER HAMILTON:

12 We're still waiting for directions. We do know that some of the employees who may be
13 RIF'ed from other departments, if we have vacancies in our department, may claim priority
14 consideration, but we don't know how many of those positions we'll be able to fill. And as
15 you know, in libraries, we have requirements for librarians. You must have a Master's
16 degree in Library Science, and we don't believe that we have many folks in County
17 government who have Master's degrees working outside of the Library Department.
18

19 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

20 So unless there are some very specific positions that you could potentially retrain for, you
21 would have to either keep these positions vacant or go out and hire folks who are qualified
22 from the outside.
23

24 PARKER HAMILTON:

25 We believe that would be an option, yes.
26

27 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

28 OK. Just want to understand that. And then, to the point that the chair raised as it relates
29 to-- you can look at your work years, and clearly the work years have been declining over
30 the last few years, but our hours have not changed, so what changes--what modifications
31 are we taking internally to--to rectify that? I've heard anecdotally from folks from different
32 libraries where there have been whole staffs who have ended up getting sick because one
33 person gets sick, and--you know, you can speculate as to whether or not people are just
34 working too hard and they just are getting run down, and so if somebody gets ill, it's easy
35 for all of them to get ill, but I just am curious as to what are we doing internally to make

May 4 2009



1 sure that we're lessening that workload amongst the folks that are there, since we haven't
2 modified the hours to reflect the staffing?

3
4 PARKER HAMILTON:

5 First of all, I haven't heard that about entire staff getting sick. But we-- but Mr. Leventhal
6 said, we value our library employees, and we work really hard in order to come up with
7 efficiencies and new models of services in order to ensure that no one is working beyond
8 their required hours. We are looking at centralized programming so that folks who have to
9 spend more time on the desk, they will not also have to spend more time on the desk and
10 also do programming. We have created a circle of support because there are vacancies in
11 some branches and not vacancy in others. And so we have transferred staff around in
12 order to ensure that no one library bears the full burden of the vacancies that we're
13 carrying. So in terms of looking at efficiencies, we recently implemented receipt printers in
14 the libraries. That's helping staff at the circulation desk. We are--we received a grant from
15 Friends of the Library to help us do centralized programming so that we can bring a
16 number of programs up to the branches-- I'm sorry, up to administration so that branch
17 staff will not have to do programs such as book discussions and things like that. We want
18 our staff to continue to do the Early Literacy Program because there's a certain skill set
19 with that, but we believe that there are programs that we can do centrally with support
20 from the Friends of the Library that will, again, free our staff up to work the public service
21 desk, which is the core function.

22
23 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

24 Has there been any analysis within the Executive branch similar to what Council staff has
25 just done? I mean, it would seem to me that at some point, if the hours--if the staffing
26 continues in the direction that it is and the hours continue at the staffing that it is and we
27 haven't made significant capital infrastructure investments--I mean, I know we've had
28 these conversations previously, but we're not really doing a lot right now that will ease the
29 burden of staff to try and-- have you done any analysis to look at what organizational
30 structure or work-hour structure adequately reflects kind of a sustainable work
31 environment for the number of work years that you have right now?

32
33 PARKER HAMILTON:

34 We have. We've done at least one workload study with our circulation staff, we've done
35 one workload study with the information staff, and we're preparing to do a full-blown

May 4 2009



1 comprehensive workload study after we get information regarding the RIP and decisions
2 from the Council. Yes, we are looking at those items every day.

3
4 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

5 So if that comes back and the workload study shows that we are, in fact, way over the top
6 with what we're asking our employees to do, will--would the Executive branch come back
7 and make a recommendation to have the hours more adequately reflect the number of
8 work years?

9
10 PARKER HAMILTON:

11 We'll have to take our findings to the County Executive, yes.

12
13 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

14 So he's-- he'll be getting that information and presumably at some point could be making a
15 decision along those lines?

16
17 PARKER HAMILTON:

18 Well, we'll have to see what we have to take to him. We're hoping that we do not have
19 anything to take to him because we're hoping that you'll approve the budget as it is, but
20 we'll have to look at the reality. Once we look at the reality--and we've been doing it--we
21 will take that information back to him. Then he'll make the appropriate decision. Then we'll
22 probably come back to you.

23
24 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

25 OK. So I guess, then, that's important, though. So then--as Mr. Leventhal just pointed out,
26 there are already those contending that you are already exceeding kind of the maximum
27 workload for individual employees. So you're saying at this point, you don't think that's the
28 case, but with the changes that are in this year's budget, you may be--you might be there.

29
30 PARKER HAMILTON:

31 Currently, we're able to manage with the hours and the staff that we have with the
32 reduction in programs and services that we're taking and the efficiencies and new models
33 of the services that we're putting in place. So by those things that we're doing, we believe
34 that currently, we can continue to deliver service, yes.

May 4 2009



1 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

2 Deliver service over the same number of hours we're currently delivering service at?

4 PARKER HAMILTON:

5 As long as we continue to reduce some of our programs, reduce some of our services,
6 build in efficiencies and new models of services. And we're continually looking at new
7 models of services, so we are changing how we're doing work in the libraries.

9 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

10 OK. OK. Thank you.

12 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

13 OK. Thank you, Councilmember Knapp. And there are no other questions at this point, so
14 the Council is accepting the committee's recommendations on the libraries' operating
15 budget, and we'll now move on to the Silver Spring Library Project CIP.

17 COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

18 Great. OK. The committee's action on the CIP was just--we were just consistent, Essie,
19 am I right, with what the Executive recommended. What did the committee actually do
20 with respect to the Silver Spring Library?

22 ESSIE McGUIRE:

23 Sure. The--

25 COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

26 We had a big discussion about where we stand in the process, but our actual decision
27 was what?

29 ESSIE McGUIRE:

30 The decision-- there were a couple of decisions, and one was to--the committee did make
31 a recommendation to program the current cost and scope information for the library into
32 the six-year CIP into the amended PDF this year and adjust the text to reflect both the
33 status of the project and also some of the committee's concerns regarding disability
34 access. So there were a number of changes recommended to the PDF that would
35 considerably reduce expenditures in '10 but considerably increase them and '11, '12, '13.

May 4 2009



1 And the committee's intent here was that the approved PDF for Silver Spring that
2 remained in the CIP did not in any way reflect the current cost or implementation
3 schedule, as it had significant construction dollars ending in '10. And so the committee did
4 recommend to program the full estimate, as it's known at this time, which is clearly very
5 preliminary, but that it would reflect--excuse me--the intent of the Council and the
6 Executive in going forward with this project and creating space for it in the next three
7 years.

8
9 COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

10 And so construction, Parker Hamilton, would begin when on Silver Spring Library. Or
11 David Dise?

12
13 ESSIE McGUIRE?????:
14 '11.

15
16 DAVID DISE:

17 We're still proceeding with design at this time. The design may be completed in late FY10,
18 in which case we would then need construction dollars at that time. We might come--our
19 original plan would, per the standard model, would be complete design and then come to
20 Council for appropriation of dollars for construction.

21
22 COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

23 OK. And this is a good time, David Dise --you and I had an exchange of messages with a
24 constituent about an initiative that your department is undergoing to inform the public
25 about the status of major construction projects. For those of us who spend a lot of time in
26 downtown Silver Spring, you have the Transit Center going up, you have the Civic
27 Building going up, and then a lot of discussion around the library, and I got a request for
28 sort of a real-time update so that--so that citizens can go to our website and find out,
29 "Yeah, when is that thing going to be available?" Could you--you gave a really good and
30 prompt response to that constituent, and maybe you could take this opportunity to inform
31 our television viewing audience about the department's plans in that regard.

32
33 DAVID DISE:

34 Yeah. I'd be delighted to, and thank you for the opportunity. The Department of General
35 Services is trying to maximize the use of the internet in order to inform constituents and

May 4 2009



1 residents of what's happening. Certainly, when we do construction projects, when we build
2 County facilities throughout the County, the residents in that area are understandably
3 interested in what's happening. And so we are, in the--over the next fiscal year, with Silver
4 Spring being the first target because of the nature of those projects, creating websites for
5 each one of our capital projects, and on each website will be a summary of the project,
6 plans, schedules, who's building it, what the costs--cost estimates are, as well as progress
7 photos, and in some cases, actually putting web cams up to show progress. And we'll start
8 rolling those out this summer, with Silver Spring projects being at the--because of the
9 nature of the interest in the progress of those. Others will be fire stations. East
10 Germantown is another one, for instance.

11
12 COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

13 Excellent. Well, that will be very helpful. So on the top of page 2, for Councilmembers'
14 benefit and especially the Council President, who's going to have to be involved in
15 scheduling this discussion, it states that on March 19, the Executive transmitted an
16 amendment to the Silver Spring Urban Renewal Plan, and that amendment is now
17 pending with Park and Planning. Park and Planning has 60 days, until May 19, for review
18 and recommendation, so later this month, the Council should be receiving Park and
19 Planning's recommendation on the issue of the pedestrian bridge and whether the Silver
20 Spring Urban Renewal Plan should be amended to allow a pedestrian bridge over Wayne
21 Avenue, from the Wayne Avenue garage to the third floor of the new Silver Spring Library.
22 That has significant implications for our parking policy and the cost of the project as to will
23 we construct additional parking spaces, either for the general public or just for people with
24 disabilities. And so from that decision that the Council makes on the Urban Renewal Plan,
25 we'll be able to complete the decisions that need to be made about the scope and, in fact,
26 the cost of the Silver Spring Library. So, following the public hearing, then the Council
27 President will obviously work with our staff to schedule committee and Council review on
28 this issue. And on the issue of disability access in the Silver Spring library, that also will
29 follow--that's very much intertwined with the decision on the pedestrian bridge--where will
30 parking occur, and how will disability access a drop-off space--all of those issues do relate
31 to where the parking is located. And so--so text at the bottom of page 2 gives us the
32 current status, and the PDF will be amended if the Council --if the full Council approves
33 the committee's recommendation, the language reads, at the bottom of page 2, "Funds
34 appropriated for this project may be used to design a pedestrian bridge over Wayne
35 Avenue only if the Council amends the Silver Spring Urban Renewal Plan to permit such a

May 4 2009



1 pedestrian bridge. The Council has requested design options for the Silver Spring library
2 site that include additional design options for disability access to the library. At least one
3 option must include on-site parking for individuals with disabilities, and at least one option
4 must include drop-off access. Conceptual designs for these additional disability access
5 options must be received by the Council prior to the Council's public hearing on the Silver
6 Spring Urban Renewal Plan amendment. The current design estimate is based on the
7 building massing studies developed during the Site Master Plan pre-building design, with
8 costs based on historic cost per square foot of similar projects. A revised project cost will
9 be developed and provided during the Design Development phase.

10
11 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

12 OK. And thank you. Councilmember Floreen has a question or comment.

13
14 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

15 Thank you. So has it--it has been determined that this will be a totally freestanding project,
16 correct?

17
18 COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

19 The Silver Spring Library?

20
21 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

22 Yeah.

23
24 COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

25 Are you asking about the location of housing?

26
27 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

28 Well, I'm asking about the library itself. It's going to be, like, on its own?

29
30 DAVID DISE:

31 Yes. The design scheme calls for a freestanding library building and--

32
33 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

34 Unattached to anything else.

May 4 2009



1 DAVID DISE:

2 Unattached to the affordable housing and the housing component adjacent to it.

4 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

5 OK. When --so--I appreciate the work of the committee on this--the bridge issue. It's been
6 a thorny one. And when do you expect, Mr. Dise, that we would have a-- well, there's that
7 part, the plan. Is the expectation that that would take--we would see that in the summer?

9 COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

10 Well, I'm just making a guess here. It's really up to the Council president and the staff as
11 to how to schedule, but it would seem to me that we could have a full-blown discussion,
12 Mr. President, of the pedestrian bridge and the Silver Spring Urban Renewal Plan,
13 probably in late June. I'm just guessing based on the timeframes here.

15 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

16 Sounds about right.

18 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

19 Schedule-wise, it's likely to occur then.

21 COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

22 Right.

24 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

25 And at that point, you--will you-- will the department have the project designed, or a...

27 DAVID DISE:

28 The design is underway right now. Depending on the results of the parking analysis, we
29 may want to put the design into two phases, the first being the site plan, in order to
30 anticipate. For instance, if we were to do underground--

32 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

33 Right. I suppose if you--if the bridge is not approved, the concept of the bridge is not
34 approved, you would have to go back to the drawing board?

May 4 2009



1 DAVID DISE:

2 We would have to then redesign the site with anticipation of underground parking or some
3 sort of parking onsite that would have an effect upon the construction of the housing
4 component adjacent to it. Yes.

5
6 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

7 And you don't have any thinking about that now?

8
9 DAVID DISE:

10 Well, we have recommended not to do that. We think--

11
12 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

13 You don't want to do that, but if you had to do that--you haven't worried about that yet?

14
15 DAVID DISE:

16 That would be a significant change in the engineering.

17
18 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

19 That is in the other--later category. So, so far you've fully designed it to include this bridge.

20
21 DAVID DISE:

22 That--we have designed it with the anticipation of utilizing the Wayne Avenue garage for
23 the parking for the library. Whether there's the bridge or not, we would still anticipate using
24 the Wayne Avenue garage.

25
26 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

27 So will the committee then take a look at the bridge--at the whole design, then, in June?

28
29 DAVID DISE:

30 In response to the committee's request, we'll come back with all of the options that they've
31 requested.

32
33 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

34 Yeah.

May 4 2009



1 DAVID DISE:

2 There's about four or five different scenarios and what the cost and time impacts of those
3 would be. We have the engineer working on those right now, and hopefully we'll have
4 those studies completed by late May or early June.

5
6 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

7 Well, then my question is this. Is there--so there's--there are many elements of this
8 unresolved.

9
10 DAVID DISE:

11 That's correct.

12
13 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

14 Apart from the bridge, because of some other site issues.

15
16 DAVID DISE:

17 Depending on the outcome of the parking issue, yeah.

18
19 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

20 Then, of course, you have the Purple Line matter. But--so do you have sufficient dollars in
21 the CIP to accommodate the evolution of this project?

22
23 DAVID DISE:

24 For design? We have sufficient funds for design at this time. For construction, again, it
25 depends on the outcome of that decision.

26
27 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

28 So, it'll depend. So based on what you're saying, sometime this summer or maybe in the
29 fall, we would have the fully designed--we would know what we're looking at?

30
31 DAVID DISE:

32 We're meeting with the community now in a series of charrettes to do the outside design
33 appearance of the library. Once those charrettes are completed and we have a sense of
34 where we're going with the design, that'll be completed. The design is going to take
35 another 10 to 12 months for the final design. The stacking is occurring right now. But

May 4 2009



1 again, parking options could affect how the floor layouts go on the library. This is a critical
2 juncture to determine what the parking impact has on what this facility will look like.

3
4 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

5 Yeah. Absolutely. So, OK, then we're really looking at--

6
7 DAVID DISE:

8 A year.

9
10 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

11 A year till we get it nailed down, with all these moving parts. OK. Thank you. Appreciate
12 that.

13
14 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

15 Thank you. Councilmember Knapp has a question or comment.

16
17 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

18 Mr. President, following up on Ms. Floreen's comments, so we have a year before we
19 actually understand what the real numbers are. So I'm guessing that we're not expecting
20 this number to come down.

21
22 DAVID DISE:

23 We are not expecting this number to come down, no. If parking is moved on-site, the
24 number could go up dramatically.

25
26 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

27 OK. Well, I just feel compelled to make an observation. About seven months ago, we had
28 a conversation upstairs on the seventh floor of the Council building, had a conversation
29 about funding needed infrastructure for our communities, and this Council voted to not
30 support certain infrastructure for a community to the north that would have been roughly
31 half of the cost increase associated with just this library, which we know is only going to
32 increase more. And so I guess it's just worth noting that I think this is a good idea, I think
33 funding libraries in all of our communities are a good idea, but we're funding twice as
34 much just in the cost escalation here than we were looking for funding a community in
35 Clarksburg for their basic infrastructure for libraries and basic activities six months ago. So

May 4 2009



1 I just-- it's just interesting to note how much more we're spending just in the added costs
2 here relative to what we were not willing to support, infrastructure in our other
3 communities.

4
5 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

6 OK. Thank you, Councilmember Knapp. Councilmember Floreen again.

7
8 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

9 One other point, and I should have asked this with respect to the college, too. For capital
10 projects, I've been told--out on the street, at least--that bids are coming back significantly
11 below what the budget has been.

12
13 DAVID DISE:

14 They are. Yes.

15
16 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

17 So are we adjusting our CIP as we work through this to reflect that fact?

18
19 DAVID DISE:

20 We are. We are seeing--

21
22 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

23 Because I don't see it happening.

24
25 DAVID DISE:

26 Bid results--

27
28 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

29 Maybe it's in your head.

30
31 DAVID DISE:

32 Bid results are coming in between 15% and 20% below estimates, which is good news for
33 the County in the saving of its dollars, not necessarily great news for the construction
34 community. But-- and we looking at estimates right now--we're still seeing escalation, but

May 4 2009



1 it's in the 2% range as opposed to the standard estimated 5% range that the County uses
2 in its models.

3
4 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

5 Well, if that is a fundamental premise, it seems to me we have some leeway in our capital
6 program.

7
8 DAVID DISE:

9 We may.

10
11 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

12 And I would ask you to take a look at that, and, Steve, if you can talk to Glenn about that,
13 because our numbers are probably inflated at this point. I don't think it's--I don't think it's
14 our intention to give you that extra space to work around in. We'd like to use that, if
15 necessary, for making the budget function.

16
17 DAVID DISE:

18 We understand. Our concern always, of course, is, when will it come back?

19
20 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

21 Not that we don't want to--if we can produce these projects as intended at a lesser rate,
22 let's reflect that reality in our numbers. OK. Thanks.

23
24 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

25 OK. Thank you. There are no other questions, so with that, the Council will accept the
26 committee recommendation, and we will now--thank you, Chair Leventhal.

27
28 COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

29 Thank you, Mr. President, and let me thank Mr. Berliner and Mrs. Trachtenberg, also, for
30 their work on these library issues in the HHS Committee.

31
32 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

33 Thank you. We're now--thank you all at the table. We're now going to move on to the
34 Department of Technology Services and other technology budgets, and cable television
35 communications, and I will turn to the chair of the MFP Committee, Councilmember

May 4 2009



1 Trachtenberg, for the committee reports on these subjects, beginning with the Department
2 of Technology Services.

3
4 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

5 Thank you, President Andrews. I'm going to start my presentation off this morning by
6 acknowledging both my colleagues who serve on the MFP Committee with me. Before I
7 came down this morning, I counted up the budget-related worksessions within the
8 Management and Fiscal Policy Committee, and there were 18 of them, half of them
9 specific to some operating budgets of various departments --a lot of those budgets placed
10 on the Consent Calendar before us. But as I know my colleagues know, there are two very
11 substantial areas where the committee really does a bulk of their work and decision--
12 decisionmaking around, and one clearly is the technology area, and the other is the
13 impressive topic of compensation and benefits, which, of course, we'll be discussing next
14 week, and the committee still has a worksession this Friday to make some final decisions.
15 And it was last Wednesday that the committee went through, piece by piece, the
16 technology numbers, so that is what we're going to look at this morning, and we're going
17 to start off with an operating budget for the Department of Technology Services--again, a
18 topic of great conversation within MFP for at least the last year and a half, because we've
19 been trying to work closely with our folks from the department to get some quantifiable
20 numbers, not only on staffing, but in terms of investment. And I know the department has
21 worked closely with us. Last Wednesday, the committee recommended the adoption of
22 the Executive's FY10 recommended budget for the Department of Technology Services.
23 The budget is 32,069,270. It's actually down almost five percent from FY09. There were,
24 as I said, several worksessions where this was discussed. There was a proposal by
25 Councilmember Ervin to reduce it by an additional one percent. That did not pass when
26 we discussed this last Wednesday, so again, the recommendation, 2-1, was to go ahead
27 and support the Executive's recommended budget for the department.

28
29 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

30 Thank you, Councilmember Trachtenberg, and I want to say that I think the committee,
31 which I am serving on currently, has benefited very much from a lot of good scrutiny that
32 you have led and has been very well supported by Dr. Torgas, our IT Advisor, who we
33 are very lucky to have. He brings a, I think, a sharpness of analysis and great experience
34 that we would have to pay a lot of money for if he wasn't on our staff. So thank you, Dr.

May 4 2009



1 Toregas, for your very helpful analysis of these technology budgets. I do not see --I see a
2 question now, or a comment, from Councilmember Knapp.

3
4 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

5 Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to follow up a similar question I had with libraries.
6 Last year, under the Retirement Incentive Plan, how many employees did you have that
7 availed themselves of retire--of the retirement opportunity?

8
9 STEVEN EMANUEL:

10 Two.

11
12 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

13 Two. And did you--then did you backfill those positions?

14
15 STEVEN EMANUEL:

16 One.

17
18 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

19 OK. Two and one. And how many people are eligible for this year?

20
21 STEVEN EMANUEL:

22 We have approximately 25.

23
24 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

25 25 available, or eligible. And have you had conversations as to what you would do as to
26 how to backfill any of those as necessary, or did you have a sense... I know this varies
27 from department to department. Some have big, wide, spread-out departments and don't
28 really have a good clue of how many people might avail themselves of it. Some have a
29 sense what number might--might take advantage of it. Do you have a sense at all as to, of
30 the 25 that you have, how many might do something, since this is a pretty fast-moving
31 train?

32
33 STEVEN EMANUEL:

34 We actually do have a sense that there are approximately two or three people that may
35 avail themselves of this one, and the challenge is, because these are the very, very long-

May 4 2009



1 term folks with a lot of core knowledge, it is going to be a very challenging process to
2 regain that--those capabilities.

3
4 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

5 So, I mean, given that kind of capability, is that something you'd then end up wanting to try
6 and rehire for, or that something you'd probably want to try and consult out with to try and-
7 -

8
9 STEVEN EMANUEL:

10 We're going to look--we've taken every opportunity, as I've mentioned to the MFP
11 members, that every time we have a vacancy, we don't just assume that we're going to
12 replace those people. We have a process that vets through the entire organization up
13 here, talking through what our current strategies are, what our current needs are, what the
14 current challenges are, and we look at the best solution for replacement of a person.
15 We've done a number of small reorganizations. We did one relatively large one about a
16 year ago which we believe capped some opportunity. So, you know, we're taking it fiscally
17 prudently to make sure that we only hire where we need, and we are doing assessment
18 ongoing about any consultation assistance that we get, as well.

19
20 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

21 Thank you.

22
23 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

24 Thank you, Councilmember Knapp. Council Vice President Berliner.

25
26 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

27 It's my understanding, Dr. Toregas, that you were not favorably disposed towards
28 Councilmember Ervin's suggestion for a one percent further reduction, and as somebody
29 who's not on the committee, but I know that the chair shares--

30
31 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

32 Anymore. You used to be.

33
34 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

May 4 2009



1 Any more. I used to be. And I know that the chair shares the desire of ensuring that we
2 save as much as we can in this budget. The committee's recommendation was not to
3 adopt her proposal, and as one who, at the beginning of this budget process, this is where
4 I thought we could make potential savings, so I would be grateful if you would give voice
5 to why you believe that this is as lean as we can be in this time when we are making, as
6 you appreciate, very painful cuts in other places, that there isn't a one percent additional
7 savings of \$320,000 that we could have achieved here in a manner that would not do
8 great damage to our moving forward with the technology improvements that are
9 necessary.

10
11 COSTIS TOREGAS:

12 Mr. Berliner, I'm always interested and want to serve each and every one of the
13 Councilmembers. I did not-- I was not aware of the one percent suggestion before it was
14 made, therefore I didn't have time to explore what the impact would be. So when it was
15 made, in fact, I didn't opine at all, but simply said, this is something that should be
16 explored. I think the discussion was more to the degree of where would it be made, and
17 there was no suggestion as to where that one percent cut would be made. If you ask me
18 today, I would say that any department probably can have their budgets adjusted--

19
20 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

21 Say that again.

22
23 COSTIS TOREGAS:

24 If you ask me today--

25
26 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

27 I am asking you today.

28
29 COSTIS TOREGAS:

30 Any department can have budgets adjusted, but there will be consequences, so it
31 behooves me as your analyst to provide you with the consequences, and when the one
32 percent cut suggestion was made, I did not know the consequences because it was a
33 proposal that was just put on the table. If you ask me today again, I would say that the
34 DTS budget should be looked on as a way to incur further savings in departments other
35 than DTS. That's a strand????? that I would like to explore with you as the budget

May 4 2009



1 discussions go on. DTS provides automation tools to all departments of County
2 government. Therefore, it behooves the Council, I think, to be looking at how other
3 departments are using automation and whether they're able to reduce their operating
4 budgets because of automation. You see this in some of the subsequent items that Ms.
5 Trachtenberg will present to you--the DCM program, the cable program, other--and the
6 TechMod Program, where significant savings can be had in departments other than DTS.
7 So my first reaction is to make sure that technology is being effectively used in
8 departments other than DTS and are able to incur cost savings. I hope that those two
9 different answers satisfy you.

10
11 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

12 Let me seek clarification with respect to the state of your analysis with respect to a
13 potential reduction in the DTS budget itself, the order of magnitude that my colleague had
14 proposed and which you did not have an opportunity to assess at that moment in time. Are
15 you in a position now to advise us as to what you think the consequences would be for
16 DTS with respect to a one percent reduction?

17
18 COSTIS TOREGAS:

19 I am not. We have a proposed reduction from the Executive of 4.5%.

20
21 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

22 Understood.

23
24 COSTIS TOREGAS:

25 And I'm not-- I'm not ready to--to give you the impact of the further one percent.

26
27 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

28 I guess what I'd like to suggest, then, for my colleagues' consideration, is the possibility of
29 putting that one percent, if you will, on the reconciliation, if that's what it is, pending some
30 assessment from our staff with respect to what the consequences would be if, in fact,--if,
31 in fact, we chose to go that route, because I don't think we're in a position to make that
32 judgment now.

33
34 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

35 Right. And--

May 4 2009



1
2 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

3 Excuse me. That would have been the effect of Councilmember Ervin's amendment.
4

5 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

6 Right.
7

8 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

9 So...so, in effect, I want to, if Councilmember Ervin would like to make that amendment, I
10 think I would want to give her that opportunity.
11

12 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

13 Yeah. Thank you very much. It's a--it's a good conversation to be having right now. I
14 approached Dr. Torgas in the back of the room, and our conversation went to this OLO
15 report, July 31, 2007, on the inventory of internal service functions performed by different
16 county departments. And it seems to me that DTS really should be the central location for
17 all of these functions, and what we have in County government are functions that go
18 across each and every department, and if there were some analysis done in this area, we
19 could realize a savings of \$15 million--around \$15 million--if we were to centralize all these
20 functions in DTS. What I was merely trying to do with my suggestion last week was to start
21 really getting departments to focus on the fact that we may have to come back and cut
22 deeper. If we--if we do not receive this waiver next week of \$79 million, we're coming
23 back, and we're going to say, you're going to have to cut to the bone, and it's not going to
24 be pleasant. I--my suggestion was to put the one percent, or \$320,000, on the
25 reconciliation list. It was not recommended by the committee, but I think, you know, we're
26 dealing with a couple of different issues here. One is savings, and then two is, moving
27 forward, what's the best approach County government wide? And I think the best
28 approach is to--is to support the work of DTS by consolidating all these functions and
29 saving the County millions of dollars as a result. But at this point, I would like to go back to
30 my initial recommendation, which is to put the one percent, or the \$320,000, on the
31 reconciliation list, pending further analysis of the impact of such a reduction.
32

33 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

34 Actually--
35

May 4 2009



1 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

2 Let me give the chair of the committee an opportunity to comment, and then we'll have a
3 discussion about that motion.

4
5 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

6 I appreciate the spirit in--

7
8 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

9 Roger.

10
11 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

12 Oh. OK. I'm sorry about that.

13
14 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

15 I will second the motion.

16
17 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

18 OK.

19
20 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

21 Oh. I'm appreciative of the spirit in which the proposal is made, but I guess, you know,
22 here is my perspective, which is, I understand that we don't have definitive numbers, and
23 we might have to come back and adjust a number of things, not just that which is placed
24 before you today specific to technology. And there was a very energetic effort made last
25 Wednesday to cut from the Executive's proposed budget around technology, and there
26 was close to \$4 million made in cuts. And I think it would be unfair not to put this additional
27 one percent cut on DTS into proper context, which is, I understand that if we want to
28 identify one percent or five percent, we can do that. Of course, there is consequence to
29 that, and it was my opinion, and it still is that yes, it would be nice to put one percent of
30 their budget on the reconciliation list, but in the scheme of things, given what we know at
31 this point, I did not see it as being critical. And so I, you know, just will state that for the
32 record. I would entertain some comment from Mr. Emanuel as to why we should not place
33 the one percent on the reconciliation list. And obviously, it is up to my colleagues to make
34 the final determination, but at this point, to single out one department function saying we
35 might need the money--well, heck, we could do that for every department budget, and I

May 4 2009



1 don't know that we really want to go there. And quite frankly, as I said, there was almost
2 \$4 million worth of cuts provided by the committee last Wednesday. Steve?

3
4 STEVEN EMANUEL:

5 Thank you very much. What I would like to remind Council--DTS is somewhat unique in
6 this format because we are managing a number of the enterprise processes, functions,
7 and, in some cases, budget. One of the challenges that we have faced since I've been
8 here for the last two years, with the two savings plans prior to this and the FY10
9 challenges that we're going through--only slightly half of our overall operating budget is
10 resources. The other half of our budget is primarily enterprise contracts, their maintenance
11 agreements that are covering the enterprise. So these are amounts that we don't have the
12 opportunity to reduce when the financial crisis comes to bear. These are commitments
13 that we've had to make, and we've taken the opportunity of looking hard and deep and
14 how to remove maintenance agreements that are unnecessary, that we don't believe
15 serve the County value, and we have done that. But when we come to these decreases
16 that are mandated on us, a large portion of these are resource- oriented, and this past
17 year, with the FY10 budget, we've taken significant resource reductions to meet our
18 budget reduction overall, and we've managed contract processes to the best we can.
19 We've renegotiated significant professional service agreements and the agreements that
20 are being used across the enterprise by more than DTS. So we've taken every
21 opportunity, as I mentioned in the previous session, that we believe that we have really
22 severely reduced our resource capabilities, and there are no reductions significantly in the
23 number of requests that come to DTS for support. So the challenge we have is, you know,
24 we are constantly looking how to do more with less--less people, less dollars, looking at
25 every opportunity, and we also need to remind Council that technology changes very
26 quickly. We've entertained a number of unfunded, unbudgeted issues that have come to
27 bear where we've actually had to ask for funding or alternative mechanisms to complete
28 those tasks when they come to fruition, and we've done that. And quite frankly, I think,
29 DTS has shown historically that we've been able to manage because the key criteria from
30 technology is, the technology that you depend on on a day-to-day basis is there for you.
31 It's like the electricity. You know, it is there, it is running, and the only time that there's a
32 hiccup, that's when people notice that, you know, we are not able to maintain that level of
33 support, which we are desperately trying to keep going. And we are going to begin to see
34 some of these reductions when we don't have people that can monitor, when we don't
35 have the solutions that are capable of giving you the long-term technology support and

May 4 2009



1 processing power that we've planned in our overall plan to keep technology current. So
2 we've taken every opportunity to elongate the life of hardware, elongate the life of
3 applications, minimize the amount of money that we spend on contracts and services, and
4 again, you know, the reductions that we're taking are clearly coming from the people at the
5 table and our resources to support you on a day-to-day basis, as well as the County. So I
6 really urge you to reconsider that opportunity, because this is clearly going to put DTS in a
7 very awkward environment unless someone tells me what not to provide support for any
8 longer, because clearly, you know, we are trying to support everything that's coming down
9 our path where someone has made a business case for that technology to survive and be
10 a part of the County government.

11
12 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

13 I'm going to propose an option here that I hope will be acceptable to the Council, and that
14 is, we did have a discussion on this last week, and we had asked the department to
15 provide some information or some alternate proposals. I don't think we've received any. I
16 would ask the maker of the motion if she would entertain a friendly amendment to break
17 the proposal into three increments so that we have more flexibility as we go. And then I
18 would ask the department --I would suggest it would be very much wise for the
19 department to provide information about what the impact would be, if the department
20 wishes to influence the Council's consideration as we go forward and look at what is likely
21 to be on the reconciliation list. So let me ask the maker of the motion if she'd be agreeable
22 to a friendly amendment...

23
24 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

25 Sure.

26
27 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

28 ... to put it in three increments so that we have that flexibility, because I was concerned
29 about the magnitude of the proposal as one lump sum in committee. And so thank you for
30 accepting that amendment. We have a number of lights. Next is Council Vice President
31 Berliner.

32
33 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

34 I just wanted to respond to the chair, who I know has worked very hard and has found
35 incredible savings. From my perspective, the reason to put this on the reconciliation list is

May 4 2009



1 precisely as Dr. Costis suggested--excuse me, Costis suggested--which is, we haven't
2 done the analysis yet as to what the impact would be, and if it comes back that the impact
3 with respect to particularly the increments is such that we all look at that and go, "I'm
4 sorry. We can't go there," then so be it. But I do believe that it is worth having that
5 analysis, having you come back and advise us as to what you believe the impact of these
6 kinds of cuts would be, and again, we can decide at that moment in time whether or not
7 we can absorb those kinds of impacts. So insofar as it had not been looked at previously, I
8 feel it is worth a fresh look.

9
10 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

11 Right, and if I could just briefly respond to that. You know, I understand your point, Roger,
12 and going back to what Steve shared, you know, it's really ultimately a tradeoff between
13 staffing and maintenance. And I'm assuming that if we have further dialogue about this,
14 that's going to very much be the crux of the conversation, and, you know, how you actually
15 strike a balance, potentially. And I'm all ears, but it seemed to me based on the
16 conversation that we'd had, and not just last Wednesday, but really over the period of the
17 last year and a half, and I stated that clearly a few moments back, and the reason I did is
18 because this has been an ongoing work in progress, and there have been efforts to
19 downsize. There have also been efforts to bring the programming, the projects, more into
20 line with what realistically could be phased in over the next few years, and I think Costis'
21 point about the fact that the savings down the road are really more likely to be seen
22 across discipline and not specific to DTS is really important to remember here. And that's
23 why, if we're really looking to delay technology projects, you know, one way we look at
24 that is through DTS, but there are other ways to look at it, which is, you could obviously
25 attack the technology budgets in various disciplines. I'm not suggesting you do that,
26 because I don't think that would be forward thinking, but I just think that we have to
27 remember that--that surgically, if we're looking to reduce \$320,000, there might be a much
28 better way to do it than to actually take it from DTS, which is, in my mind, sort of where
29 everything gets held together, and, Steve, I'm sure you would concur that that's your job.
30 So that's really more my point and why I was resistant in committee and why I'm still
31 somewhat resistant today, because if we're looking to save \$320,000 around technology, I
32 can't believe that there isn't a better way to take money out of some type of technology
33 programming. I don't think this is where you want to do it.

34
35 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

May 4 2009



1 OK. Thank you. Our next Councilmember who has a question or comment is
2 Councilmember Floreen.

3
4 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

5 Thanks. Well, you know, we've been around this block on technology for a number of
6 years. It's often been the source of resources to balance a budget in years past. And I
7 have to say, folks, and I have to observe, this is an expensive world that they're in--we're
8 in--and I think they can come up with a great reason--and their job, remember, is to
9 defend their budget. They're not going to suggest to us genuine changes. That's not their--
10 they report to the County Executive. They're here to advocate for where they are. I think
11 our job is to be careful in looking at the budget. I appreciate the hard work the committee
12 has done, but this is a boatload of money--not just this, but the overall principal --and I
13 wanted to say that I fully support Councilmember Ervin's initiative on this score. We're all
14 scrambling to find resources, and I really think this is--if you define a number, they will
15 meet that number, because they're good people, and everyone is having to give a little bit
16 in this budget. So I--my view is, I support, however Miss Ervin wants to go down the road
17 on the one percent issue. I think it is doable, and I don't think that a whole lot of further
18 conversation is really going to solve the problem.

19
20 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

21 OK. Thank you. Councilmember Elrich.

22
23 COUNCILMEMBER ELRICH:

24 One percent cuts, or any percentage cuts, across budgets are not my favorite things to do,
25 and in most of what we've been doing in committee, at least in the committees I'm on, is
26 identifying ambulances that won't be bought, pieces of equipment that won't exist, closing
27 of, you know--not having hours or adequate staffing at stations. We've made decisions
28 about, this is the program, this the price, this is what we do. This is a one percent cut
29 without any attachment to what gets taken out of the picture, and I worry about that. It's--I
30 thought we were trying to get away from that. I thought people were critical of, as I recall it,
31 of across-the-board cuts and mandating that agencies just whack percentages without
32 regard to what gets whacked in the process. I also think that the fact that this has been a
33 frequent target of reductions and savings and budget adjustments speaks really well to the
34 backward nature of technology in this place and the fact that we spend more getting things
35 done than we probably have to get spent, had we put the proper technologies in place a

May 4 2009



1 long time ago. We are really, really pathetic. We've got an emergency--you know, Roger,
2 you've talked frequently about the emergency call system that costs an enormous amount
3 of time in our response. And we're going to sit with that again this year because they don't
4 have the money to deal with it. We have not done--we have not been good stewards of
5 technology and not been good adopters of technology. And I do think that --I think even as
6 Valerie stated, that this stuff, you know, should have some effect on the departments, and
7 it should lead to benefits down the road in the departments, so I'm not sure how we get to
8 more benefits in departments and more efficient departments if we undercut the budget of
9 what's supposed to make these departments operate more efficiently. I mean, it seems
10 like we say one thing, and now we're going to go and do the exact opposite of what we
11 say. I guess--if it's going to wind up on the reconciliation list, fine, but I hope that staff then
12 comes back and says these are the actual places we're going to have to cut and, you
13 know, makes it very clear that it's not going to be the contracts, it's going to be, you know,
14 real delivered services and how this is going to play out. And if there are impacts on other
15 departments, such as savings that won't be achievable in other departments because
16 they're not able to benefit from the technology, I hope that you discuss that, too. But I just
17 think this is a ripple effect and the wrong way to go. I will say that I'm a little bit... and your
18 report says no further reduction strategies are recommended. I'd kind of hoped that
19 everybody was going to come in--again, this is something I've seen in most of the other
20 reports--are the unwanted further reductions pending, for example, either the failure to get
21 the Maintenance of Effort approved or the failure of the Council to pass the ambulance
22 fee, for example. I mean, one is a \$12 million problem. The other one is a \$79 million
23 problem. But we've got two potential problems out there, and we may have to come back
24 here anyway-- not to free up money to spend someplace else, but to free up money
25 because we can't afford to spend it, period.

26
27 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

28 OK. Thank you, Councilmember Elrich. And we have asked Dr. Torgas to give us some
29 analysis of what he thinks the impact would be of cuts that are being proposed that would
30 go on the reconciliation list, so by the time we make a decision, we'll have the benefit of at
31 least some preliminary analysis that he can provide.

32
33 JOE BEACH:

34 Mr. President.

May 4 2009



1 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

2 And --Mr. Beach, would you like to comment?

3
4 JOE BEACH:

5 If I can. We can provide illustrative impacts. As has been pointed out, this is an
6 unspecified reduction, so we certainly--if it was a specified reduction, we could provide
7 whatever information that would have on service. So we could provide some illustrative
8 impacts about what a--an additional \$320,000 reduction would do to DTS, but I want to
9 point out that the County Executive applied a 10% reduction to DTS. They were able to
10 comply with that, almost without exception, with no service impacts. In addition to that, we
11 took nearly--an over \$800,000 reduction to DCM. So in terms of contributing toward
12 solving the budget gap for this year, DTS absolutely has contributed toward that, and has
13 been pointed out, this is where we get most of our productivity improvements, this is
14 where we get our customer service improvements. I know we call on DTS throughout the
15 year for unscheduled, unbudgeted, sort of ad-hoc requests, and they do respond to that
16 within their existing resources. So I just-- I think that should be clear from what, you know,
17 what was in the Executive's budget.

18
19 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

20 All right. Before I turn to Councilmember Knapp, Councilmember Trachtenberg has a
21 suggestion.

22
23 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

24 Well, maybe part of what leads us through the next part of the conversation--again, I think
25 Nancy raised a good point, which is, we're probably not going to reach any tremendous
26 consensus here this morning--but maybe one of the things we do look at is, what's the
27 impact of that one percent cut if it was specific to staffing versus that one percent cut if it
28 was maintenance support and program oversight that was being cut. And maybe that's the
29 information, Steve, that we need to understand when we readdress the topic. Because in
30 effect, those are the questions. Do you have--what's the balance? STEVE EMANUEL:
31 That's correct. We have--we have taken every opportunity for maintenance costs to
32 reduce those. We've actually eliminated maintenance contracts. We have taken every
33 opportunity. So to Joe's point where we have come back with that large amount of money,
34 it's because we've worked--

May 4 2009



1 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

2 But give us the definition, Steve. In other words, I get you when you're making the case
3 that you feel you've already addressed it, but what I'm saying is, it needs to be
4 readdressed. And I think in order to, again, provide the proper context for any decision on
5 the numbers, if you could give us some sense of what consequence would be if there was
6 reduction in staffing versus a reduction in maintenance support. STEVE EMANUEL:
7 It would be at least two positions that we would have to remove.

8
9 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

10 But put it in writing. STEVE EMANUEL:
11 We will.

12
13 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

14 That's what we're asking you to do.

15
16 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

17 Thank you. All right. Councilmember Knapp.

18
19 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

20 Thank you, Mr. President. Always a good and healthy discussion to have. A couple of
21 questions. First, on circle 3, I want to try and get a sense of...the enterprise, the ERP
22 system is something that's generated a lot of discussion. It's something hopefully we're
23 still going to proceed with. But I was intrigued, if I look at where the changes in personnel
24 have come, we've reduced in all the enterprise applications, which, by definition, cut
25 across the organizations, and have increased the TechMod piece. And I just want to try
26 and get a sense of, what are kind of the roles of enterprise activities that we're diminishing
27 and how, given the breadth of what it is we're trying to undertake with the ERP rollout over
28 the next two years, how those pieces kind of jibe with each other. STEVE EMANUEL:
29 It has worked hand in hand. We have worked very, very hard with both Dr. Torgas as
30 well as the TechMod program to truly identify the positions that we needed. Now, two
31 years ago, when we began doing the assumptions about where we were going to be with
32 ERP, we had a lot of assumptions, and a lot of, you know, risks that we thought we would
33 take. And as we got closer to the selection--finally making the selection, we actually had
34 the opportunity of looking at both our consultants' recommendations. We also have a
35 process that's going on about what it would take to sustain this going forward, to see

May 4 2009



1 where our operations would be. But our recommendations have been to focus on it from a
2 project perspective and limit the positions to the full functions that we have that will
3 support us for long term, look at positions that would be needed temporarily--and we
4 made sure that those were contractor positions. So it's been a collaborative effort to focus
5 on what positions were required during the ramp-up to get us to the point where we could
6 actually implement the system, those functions, and those tasks that would have to be
7 long-term, functions that we didn't have today in house, and then what positions that we
8 would not need after the solution was implemented.

9
10 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

11 So, OK. Then--I'm just trying to make sense. So on page--circle 3, you've got one, three,
12 four...

13
14 COSTIS TOREGAS:

15 Mr. Knapp, could I clarify that word--the use of the word "enterprise" in circle 3 is not the
16 same as Enterprise Resource Planning, or ERP.

17
18 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

19 No, I understand, but that's what I want to try and understand is how those pieces interact.
20 If we're reducing kind of the enterprise approach--or appears to be, from a personnel
21 perspective--tell--explain a little bit the tradeoff of reducing eight enterprise-related
22 positions-- not necessarily ERP positions, but enterprise positions--and adding seven
23 TechMod positions. What is that tradeoff that we're --what we're achieving there? STEVE

24 EMANUEL:

25 In the early stages, it's almost a one-for-one tradeoff. We basically shifted resources, so
26 it's not a significant change in the overall complement in the overall, but it is a shift in the
27 functionality.

28
29 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

30 Right. So what--what is that shift? What's the functionality shift --from what to what?

31 STEVE EMANUEL:

32 In many cases, it's older technology, it's older applications, older components of our
33 organization that need to transform and shift into the new technology resources, with the
34 new tasks, the new functionality. So in many cases, what we're doing is, we're basically
35 trying to reskill our folks, and we do, in fact, know that in some cases we will not be able to

May 4 2009



1 reskill certain people, and we'll have retirements, we'll have, you know, people that leave,
2 so it is a matter of taking those positions from the enterprise that we know today to the
3 enterprise that we're going to know tomorrow.

4
5 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

6 Ms. Ervin raised the notion in this report that came out in July of 2007 of looking across
7 organizations and everyone doing technology activities, and it's a conversation we've had
8 here, I don't know, two or three times in the seven years I've been here, as to which is the
9 best approach. Do we internalize everything, do we centralize everything within the
10 department of DTS, or do we kind of have a centralized approach with tentacles out there,
11 none of which actually report back into DTS, which then creates some disjointed
12 activities? First, I want to try and get your perspective on that, and then second, back to
13 the first question I had as it related to the retirees--I know that you have a sense of what
14 you have within your department, but do you, in the course of conversations with OHR
15 and with others, have a sense of what those other departments are looking at? Because if
16 their big retirees are attached to any of their technology pieces, my guess is you're going
17 to end up bearing the brunt of that at the end of the day. And so do you have a sense of
18 what that looks like as to what other departments are facing, as it relates to technology?

19 STEVE EMANUEL:

20 Let me answer the second question first. There have been opportunities where
21 department directors have contacted me to determine whether I have the capability within
22 DTS to support a function if they have a loss of a technology support person within the
23 department. There have been a number of those conversations, and in many of the cases,
24 the answer has been yes because the support functions are on the more generic basis--
25 the more help desk, the more desktop support--so we, you know, have clearly stated that
26 yes, we have that ability to absorb, but not to the level of service that you are getting when
27 you can call the person because he's walking right down the hallway. So they've clearly
28 identified some tasks that we've fulfilled that role, and we're doing that on an ongoing
29 basis. Do I have it from an overall perspective for the retirement plan? No, I do not. I do
30 not know what the complement of my department peers have relative to technology.
31 However, a part of what we've done strategically, and as the strategic plan clearly
32 outlined, we are working with every department at every opportunity, providing
33 opportunities for them to look at what we have done, what we are faced with, challenges,
34 and the implications of making decisions outside of a collaborative environment. And, you
35 know, that response has been very, very positive. So, you know, while I understand that

May 4 2009



1 there are some parties that would say if you consolidated it all, it would limit the problem,
2 but it doesn't always. When I first arrived, Marilyn asked me a question. She said, "Do you
3 believe in a consolidated environment, or is decentralized OK?" and my answer was, there
4 are opportunities where-- excuse me--collaboration and consolidation makes sense,
5 where there are definitive efficiencies, but when you have unique environments in unique
6 areas that don't get touched on a frequent basis, you know, centralized doesn't always
7 work in that process. So, you know, I think this is discussion that has to be had. I think
8 that, you know, there are some potential opportunities there, but, you know, again, it's a--
9 it's a transforming process. The business transforms, the organizations transform, and
10 we're taking every opportunity as often as possible, as opportunities present themselves --
11 and I demonstrate that on an ongoing basis with my partnership with HHS. With their
12 transformation and modernization, I have been there full step of the way advising, you
13 know, trying to help where we can see efficiencies, strategies, and where are the types of
14 things that we want to go with technology in their innovation centers and where they're
15 going to eventually have their technology. So I do believe it's a process that does work. I
16 believe sometimes it does take the smiling face, but, you know, as I've told these folks,
17 you know, we have to provide, and we have to deliver. So, you know, if we tell folks that
18 we are going to provide something for them from a technology perspective, you know, I
19 want to make sure we can do it, because the last thing you'll do is, we work on the nine-
20 one rule--you know, for every one good thing we do, one small thing takes us back nine
21 steps. So it is very imperative that we maintain high availability, that we have high
22 cognition about what's going on in our--in our partners' areas, that we partner with them
23 along the way, and, in some cases, we've been there to supplement and bail them when
24 something has gone awry, and clearly we've done that on every opportunity possible.

25
26 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

27 You know, and the--because the other reason I think it's going to be important for us to
28 look at this will be, it's one thing for us, in a static environment, to say we like a
29 centralized/decentralized kind of a model, that we generally have, but as we look at the
30 retirements that are out there, if we look at some other things that could occur, we may
31 end up backing into another model that could also be effective, but it seems as though we
32 may want to --again, we talked about this at the Council over the last couple of weeks--
33 from a broader strategic planning perspective, say, if there are going to be reductions, to
34 be able to kind of use those reductions to make some significant policy changes or
35 organizational changes, not kind of get stuck trying to, with baling twine and chewing gum,

May 4 2009



1 put the pieces back together again. And so, I think it's going to be important as we
2 proceed through this retirement plan to understand what it looks like--not for you as much
3 as for the other departments, so that then we can have that conversation and understand
4 where the reductions have occurred and are there efficiencies that we can achieve --not
5 necessarily directly within DTS, but in the technology foray that will allow us to see
6 improvements in other parts of the government. And I--it's difficult until we know who does
7 what to make that anticipation, but it's also important for us to have a broader strategy in
8 place to understand how to assimilate if and when we end up down that road. STEVE
9 EMANUEL:

10 I don't disagree.

11
12 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

13 All right. Thank you, Councilmember Knapp. All right. We have a motion before us to put
14 three increments at 107,000, essentially, on the reconciliation list for consideration. We
15 expect to receive analysis from Dr. Torgas about what he thinks the potential impacts of
16 that would be, and perhaps from the Executive branch, as well. So with that, all in favor of
17 the motion, please raise your hand. And that is unanimous--no, 7-1. Councilmember Elrich
18 opposed, and Councilmember Trachtenberg, Councilmember Floreen, myself, Council
19 Vice President Berliner, Councilmember Knapp, Councilmember Ervin, and
20 Councilmember Leventhal in support.

21
22 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

23 Mr. President.

24
25 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

26 Yes.

27
28 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

29 Just to build on that last point, though, I think it's important for us--we're looking at the
30 whole budget right now. We're not looking just at DTS, and so there may be--I think to Ms.
31 Ervin's point--there are efficiencies to be found throughout County government, and so do
32 we need to find \$320,000 directly out of DTS? Do we need to be looking across
33 technology in other departments and understanding what that looks like? We have
34 everything in front of us right now, and I appreciate her trying to bring this notion of

May 4 2009



1 \$320,000, but it was a part of a broader conversation, and I think we shouldn't limit
2 ourselves to say, "Ah! We got to find 320 and see what the impact will be there."

3
4 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

5 No, we didn't--
6

7 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

8 And I think that's important for us to see across all of County government, because we do
9 tend to get siloed as we have these conversations, and once we put this budget away, we
10 say, "Ah! Well, we can or we can't get it there," and we need to be looking across all of our
11 departments to compare and contrast and see where we want to put our resources and
12 where we don't want to put them.
13

14 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

15 I agree, and this is preserving options for the Council as we continue to go through all the
16 budgets, which we don't have the benefit of reviewing all yet. So thank you for the insight,
17 and I think we're ready to move on, then, to the next item.
18

19 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

20 Thank you, President Andrews. Before I do that, I think the point that has been raised by
21 Councilmember Knapp is actually pretty much in line with what I suggested a few
22 moments ago, which is, you know, we can't just limit ourselves to one place, and
23 obviously, to look at all of this in the most effective way, you really have to look at each
24 piece to get-- and you have to put it into the perspective of how they all fit together. Going
25 on to item number 7, which is the FY10 operating budget for the Interagency Technology
26 Policy Coordination Committee, nondepartmental account, the committee unanimously
27 recommended the adoption of the Executive's recommended NDA. Again, there was a
28 recommendation from the Executive in his proposed budget of a reduction of \$25,000,
29 taking the FY09 level of \$30,000 down to \$5,000--again, just really a basic reduction and
30 one that I don't necessarily think we need to probably spend too much time on.
31

32 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

33 Right. No comments. I don't see any comments on this item, so that is accepted, and just
34 let me make one quick announcement, Councilmember Trachtenberg. That is that we are

May 4 2009



1 going to recess at 12:15, wherever we are at the point. We may be able to get through the
2 rest. I'm not certain. But if we can't, my plan, unless--

3
4 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

5 Well, I would publicly state that it might be difficult for me to be here this afternoon. I have
6 to go take care of something with my son. I have to get an emergency petition, potentially,
7 for him.

8
9 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

10 OK.

11
12 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

13 So I might not be able to stay in the building.

14
15 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

16 All right. Well, what we can do then is, we will reschedule those items for when you can be
17 here, because your--it would be important to have you here for those.

18
19 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

20 I should know in about an hour.

21
22 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

23 OK. All right. Let's just keep going. Next is the desktop computer modernization--no. Yes.
24 Desktop computer modernization NDA is number 8.

25
26 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

27 OK. Back on Wednesday of last week --actually, April 21, which would be almost two
28 weeks ago, the committee unanimously recommended the adoption of the Executive's
29 FY10 recommended NDA for the support of the desktop computer modernization
30 program. We discussed specifically two economies that are gained in the FY10 budget
31 proposal--the cost savings are specific to a relaxation of the replacement period for all
32 PCs, reducing it from five years to four--or rather, increasing it from four to five--and a
33 negotiated reduction in vendor fees. Again, this has been the basis of an ongoing
34 conversation with the department, and the vendor fees have been reduced from a little bit
35 over seven million to a little bit over six million. We also endorsed the recommended level

May 4 2009



1 and the revised replacement policies across the board. We talked a little bit, I know, at the
2 direction of the Council president on the Park Police MDTs, and we decided not to
3 recommend anything at this time. And one of the things we put on the table for future
4 conversation was a committee review around a potential synchronization of the
5 replacement policies of other agencies, and that would include MCPS, the College, Park
6 and Planning--in other words, bring them in line with what we're doing within the County
7 government. So that would be the unanimous recommendation of MFP.

8
9 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

10 Thank you. I don't see any questions or comments, and so the report is accepted.

11
12 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

13 OK. Thank you. Moving on to item number 9--and I suspect this will be where we end the
14 conversation this morning-- we're going to talk about the FY10 update for FiberNet. The
15 committee recommended a cut of \$693,600 in the Executive's recommended CIP,
16 FiberNet allocation. The vote was 2-1. Councilmember Ervin opposed the reduction, and
17 in effect, the committee debated the impact of reducing the CIP appropriation --which,
18 again, it's important to note that it's funded through the cable plan, and as MCPS
19 elementary schools are the primary targets for the FiberNet construction, the impact of the
20 proposed reduction is that nine rather than 25 elementary schools would be wired in
21 FY10. It was noted that all elementary schools have connectivity today, but not in the
22 broadband range that the FiberNet option would offer.

23
24 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

25 OK. All right. And that is a very concise and accurate summary. Thank you. I don't see any
26 questions or comments, so we're just going to keep going. Thank you.

27
28 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

29 Oh, OK. Great. Next item is the CIP amendment to technology modernization. Again, last
30 Wednesday, the committee unanimously recommended the adoption of the TechMod CIP
31 appropriation of \$14,946,000, and we also asked for the inclusion of \$1,875,000 to be
32 identified as savings in the Executive's FY10 recommended productivity enhancements
33 and personnel cost savings NDA. You know, obviously, again, this is another one of those
34 conversations that we've continued to have, and again, very specific to the three projects--
35 ERP, MC311, and MCtime. And obviously, we agreed to support the continued investment

May 4 2009



1 of effort, recognizing that we want to be able to quantify over and over again what the
2 savings are with the utilization and completion of these important projects. The committee
3 discussed the expected implementation of MC311 after the third quarter of FY10. Again, it
4 was outlined by Executive staff who joined us. And we agreed that the impact of the
5 deployment of this project for the last quarter of the year will have a cost savings impact
6 on many departments, and we decided since the Executive wouldn't be able to give us
7 precise impact of those savings until the third quarter, we'd identify the fourth quarter
8 savings. Hence, that's the recommendation, clearly, of the committee. And one of the
9 things we closed our discussion down indicating was that we would continue to work with
10 the Executive branch, receiving more detail from the branch as to what the actual--how
11 the actual budgets would change and by what amount in the intake function later in FY10.
12 And that goes to the conversations that we've continued to have around savings across
13 discipline and the fact that we know that the Executive branch will continue to work with
14 the committee to identify and quantify what those savings are.

15
16 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

17 Thank you. I would like to ask Dr. Toregas to describe his analysis regarding this, and
18 then I will give the Executive branch an opportunity to comment about their view of the
19 matter.

20
21 COSTIS TOREGAS:

22 I'll be very brief. This is, again, an example where the County has decided to make a
23 significant investment in upgrading the infrastructure for Finance, for HR, and for
24 Procurement. My recommendation is to stay the course, finish it as quickly as possible,
25 and the flip side is we must begin to appreciate cost savings because of the
26 implementation of that investment. And the first such shot is the MC311, where savings
27 will be available in Fiscal '10. The full Council will remember that ERP has identified
28 savings of five million and \$15 million in Fiscal '13 and '14, and they're included in the
29 operating budget impact statement of the CIP PDF. So we're on a good trajectory,
30 applying technology to outdated processes, and we need to make sure that we're able to
31 capture the savings. That's the debate that exists today. So I would certainly recommend
32 to the Council to adopt the Executive's recommendation, but to be very firm on the 1.875
33 as actual savings in Fiscal '10 that should be available. In my financial analysis, that I've
34 given you some insight to, shows me that that is very much a doable practice. That's it.

May 4 2009



1 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

2 Thank you, Dr. Torgas. And it would --does the Executive branch care to comment?

4 JOE BEACH:

5 Well, first of all, we very much appreciate Council staff's recommendation on the project
6 and his support for the project itself. Obviously, we would not concur with the \$1,875,000
7 reduction in the budget. When we provided information on the cost savings, we meant
8 more broadly, in terms of productivity improvements, efficiencies, cost avoidance, but
9 certainly budgetary reductions, as well. Our feeling was being able to stand up and begin
10 a call center during FY10 within existing resources was in itself a major achievement. So
11 at this point, we certainly appreciate the recommendation on the project, but a reduction of
12 this magnitude at an unspecified level is going to be difficult to implement.

14 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

15 Thank you. Councilmember Knapp.

17 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

18 Thank you, Mr. President. We tend to deal with a pretty large budget, and we have lots of
19 things that get in it or move around within it, and it's difficult to track it sometimes. I know
20 that--I'm pretty conscious of when the Council undertook the approval of the ERP and put
21 that in and the costs associated with that. When did the other two, the MC311 and the
22 Mctime projects, come in? And how does--how do --I mean, I know conceptually when
23 they were created, but the costs associated with them--I don't recall a big "here's \$10
24 million we're going to spend for MC311 or for Mctime," and I may just have missed it
25 because there's a lot of moving parts, but was there a time where we actually said, "We're
26 adding these, so this is a three-pronged approach? In addition to the ERP, we're doing
27 these two other things, and here's what they cost?" Or did we just kind of roll them into
28 one big bundle, and the big bundle now costs what it costs?

30 JENNIFER BARRETT:

31 I can answer on Mctime and then let Joe take over for the others. Mctime started quite a
32 few years--

34 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

35 Oh, that's the automated time. OK.

May 4 2009



JENNIFER BARRETT:

Excuse me?

COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

The automated timesheets. Got it.

JENNIFER BARRETT:

Automated timesheets. Started quite a few years ago and has been funded primarily out of the Department of Finance's operating budget, with some funds in DTS. And then after we created the TechMod project, I believe in FY09, we transferred it into the TechMod project because it fit within that overall initiative.

COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

OK.

JENNIFER BARRETT:

But we're far along the way, as you know, from your own timesheet preparation.

COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

Right. So that was just a movement from your budget into the--into the TechMod budget.

JENNIFER BARRETT:

Correct. The master lease payments remain in the Department of Finance's budget.

COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

OK.

JOE BEACH:

And MC311 was actually part of the technology modernization project the Council approved last year. Obviously, the largest part was the ERP project, but actually, at that time last year when the Council approved the appropriation, MC311 was part of that project, as well as the full implementation of MCtime. So that was--would be in the FY09 CIP.



May 4 2009

1 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

2 So the MC311 was called out specifically and costs associated with that were specifically
3 identified in last year, not just as a part of the ERP?

4
5 JOE BEACH:

6 Yes, sir.

7
8 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

9 I'll have to go back and look at that. OK. Thank you.

10
11 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

12 Thank you, Councilmember Knapp. And there are no other questions at this point, so the
13 committee recommendation is accepted.

14
15 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

16 Actually, we're still needing to talk about the cable television and Communications Plan.

17
18 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

19 Yes. That's right. Yes. So that's number 11. Correct.

20
21 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

22 Right. And if--perhaps this will finish off the morning. So I'm impressed that we've been
23 able to work--walk through these items as quickly as we have. This, again, was probably
24 the major focus of conversation within the committee last Wednesday--again, one of those
25 items that we've continued to talk about, the Cable Communications Plan, and again,
26 specifically, the cable fund expenditures. And the recommendation from the committee,
27 unanimously, was to take the following reductions. Again, I'm going to let Costis walk us
28 through each piece, if necessary, but we took a \$222,360 reduction in programming
29 support, a \$263,000 reduction on FiberNet relocations, we also took an additional cut of
30 100,000 on outside engineering services, an additional \$60,000 on legal services, and
31 probably the biggest item was the cable fund balance change. And we reduced that
32 balance by \$450,000, and I would note that the Executive had recommended a cable fund
33 balance in FY12-15 at half the policy level. So we obviously decided to take that guidance
34 and take the reduction. We also additionally discussed, over the course of several
35 worksessions, the cable office staffing issues, and we agreed that the Cable

May 4 2009



1 Communications Administrator should have adequate time to evaluate staff and
2 organizational patterns, again, in her office, so we did not look to cut a Budget Analyst
3 position, although it had been up for conversation as a potential place to go. As I said,
4 legal and engineering services were impacted, and those were two places where we
5 thought we could make some cuts. And I would note a programming reduction was made
6 across the agencies and departments, where the Executive had recommended no
7 reduction in funding, and it's equivalent, as noted in the packet, to reducing funded
8 support to 97% of FY09 levels-- again reflecting the difficult economic times. So in total,
9 the cable fund expenditure reduction that we're recommending is \$1,788,960.

10
11 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

12 OK. Thank you, Councilmember Trachtenberg. Councilmember Ervin has a question or
13 comment.

14
15 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

16 Just a clarification on the packet. I didn't--it says that we--"the committee unanimously
17 recommended the adoption of the FY10 Cable Communications Plan with the following
18 reductions." I did not agree with the FiberNet relocation.

19
20 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

21 That's correct. Yes.

22
23 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

24 I just want it to be on record.

25
26 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

27 That actually is correct, Valerie. I had--it's not in the packet, but I think you're right about
28 that. I didn't--I didn't notice that.

29
30 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

31 Yes. OK. All right. The recommendations are accepted.

32
33 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

34 OK. Sounds good. Thank you very much.

May 4 2009



1 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

2 Oh, I'm sorry.

4 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

5 Oh, OK.

7 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

8 Oh, I was so close. Sorry. OK. Here. I'm resetting it. Press again. Go ahead. You have the
9 floor.

11 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

12 Thank you very much. I do have a couple of items I'd like to bring back to the full Council
13 for discussion. One has to do with the FiberNet relocation. The other has to do with
14 outside legal services and outside engineering services, and so I would like Dr. Toregas to
15 answer a couple of questions on behalf of the Council, and that has to do with the
16 \$600,000 that remains in outside engineering services, which is paying for the tower
17 siting, a portion of that, which is around \$200,000. Am I correct? Can you just tell me what
18 is in that remaining dollar figure?

20 COSTIS TOREGAS:

21 I can very quickly tell you that there are four functions that we look to outside engineering
22 and inspection services budget for, and Miss Herrera probably will want to give us detail,
23 but it's cable inspection and testing, PEG access channels facilities upgrades and
24 engineering, transmission antenna siting applications review, and then other services,
25 which are deployment of Wi-Fi, engineering support, broadband applications, and others
26 as the department deems important to assign. Those are the four categories. Perhaps
27 Miss Herrera might give us the dollar breakdown for each one.

29 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

30 I would appreciate that.

32 MITSUKO HERRERA:

33 The dollar breakdown--Mitsuko Herrera, Cable Administrator. In Agenda Item 11, on the
34 very last page, circle 40, are the dollar breakdowns. I would again note to the Council that
35 in the '08 budget, the costs for the tower siting review, those were not included in--as part

May 4 2009



1 of the cable fund. Those were in the DTS budget in FY08. So the large increase between
2 FY08 and FY09 was the inclusion of those costs, and the \$100,000 reduction will come
3 entirely from inspection.
4

5 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

6 Can I ask you a question, just to put this in some context? If we're looking at other
7 jurisdictions in terms of how they utilize their outside contractors, are we paying a higher
8 or a considerable amount more for quality control for cable companies, if we were to
9 compare ourselves to our neighboring jurisdictions? Do you happen to have any
10 information on that?
11

12 MITSUKO HERRERA:

13 I'm not sure I understand the nature of the question.
14

15 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

16 If--it has come to my attention that some jurisdictions have totally stopped looking at these
17 construction violations. I don't think that's advisable, but it seems to me if you stack us up
18 to the jurisdictions that surround us in terms of what their--what their outside contractor--
19 what they're paying outside contractors for doing these-- these jobs, this is a considerable
20 amount of money. So I'm just asking before we make any decisions that I would like
21 someone to get back to me with some sort of a comparison on whether or not this figure
22 that we're paying for outside contractors is in keeping with our surrounding neighbors in
23 this--in this way. I'm just very curious about this. I have been for a while.
24

25 MITSUKO HERRERA:

26 In--the jurisdiction that's probably of most similar size to us would be Fairfax County. They
27 currently have an in-house staff of nine people who provide inspection services, as
28 compared to--we have two, and then we have several part-time people. Those are all--
29 ours are all contractors. Arlington uses the same firm to provide their inspection services.
30 Prince George's county uses the same firm that we do to provide those services. I'm not
31 sure who Anne Arundel uses, and I'd have to check on some of the other jurisdictions.
32

33 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

34 I'm just very curious about that. If I could that information just as some baseline number.
35

May 4 2009



1 MITSUKO HERRERA:

2 Certainly. I would also note that in our agreements with the municipalities, part of the
3 reason why we retain a certain amount of the franchise fees is specifically directed to
4 provide those services.

5
6 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

7 OK. I appreciate that. That's one question. My second question has to do with--with
8 outside legal services. There are still \$310,000 remaining in the budget for outside legal
9 services. And we are being extremely well served by you, Mitsi, and we're so excited that
10 you're here running the cable office. I know you have experience in this regard, but we're
11 currently being served by Cliff Royalty at the County Attorney's Office. And in your
12 experience as a telecommunications attorney, I'm curious about the--maintaining this level
13 of service, when we are being so well served by your experience and the County
14 Attorney's Office and why we still need to have a \$310,000 item in the budget for legal
15 services. If you could speak to that.

16
17 MITSUKO HERRERA:

18 Certainly. Well, I appreciate the high praise, but I would say that I am a sum of my staff,
19 both my in-house staff and our Council staff--our outsource staff. What I believe is
20 appropriate is to exercise greater control over --and oversight--over how we spend those
21 resources. In circle 6 and 7, you can see the areas that the Council is looking at. The
22 primary--if you look at it, the cable fund, cable franchising fees, PEG fees, have been
23 under assault for the last five years. We just went through our own delegate--my personal
24 delegate--introducing a bill which would eliminate \$18 million, the entire cable fund, and
25 send it off to the state.

26
27 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

28 Who was this?

29
30 MITSUKO HERRERA:

31 Delegate Hixon.

32
33 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

34 Delegate Hixon, the chair of Ways and Means.

May 4 2009



1 MITSUKO HERRERA:

2 I would also note that it apparently didn't seem to rank a phone call to anybody in the
3 County to let her know she was doing this. There have been bills that were introduced at
4 the federal level. There have been multiple proceedings at the FCC. There have been
5 numerous lawsuits. In all of these cases, we comprise --our largest cable operator, we
6 comprise less than one percent of their total subscribers. We cannot survive as an island.
7 It is important that we participate and try to proactively push forward on these things. Your
8 office has been inundated with calls, and I am sorry that in many cases, the answer you
9 get back from my office is, well, that's all the federal law permits us to do. And the way to
10 change that is to actually go forward in what is a very favorable political climate --a new
11 FCC, almost an entire new board will come forward. There are--and these items that are
12 listed on there, as good as Cliff is and I may be, we can't do all of this. In large part, what
13 we are trying to move the FCC is to have fact-based policymaking, and what that requires
14 is, we assemble some of those facts. We hire someone to help draft those along the lines
15 that we want. We go down and we talk to--and what I'm hoping is that as we're proceeding
16 in these, is to have greater participation from the MFP--other Councilmembers who would
17 like to, but particularly with Chair Trachtenberg--is to talk to the FCC and bring what is our
18 actual experience actually delivering programs and services, because frankly, there is a
19 lot of policy decisions made in Washington in which there is no consideration of the facts.
20 And I would point you to just one single one, which is that competition lowers prices. And
21 we have had competition in this County, and at the same time, in the past year, subscriber
22 rates went up 4.9%, 7.9%, and 4.2%. And there are still proceedings at the FCC in which
23 they talk about how we need to eliminate local franchising because that will speed
24 competition, and based on five-year-old data, that will mean that prices will drop 17%. And
25 as good as I am and as passionate as I am on these subjects, I cannot find the time to
26 draft a number of these pleadings. It is my goal to--I have had several conversations with
27 the County Attorney's staff. I have made a commitment that work that is engaged, that a
28 summary will be sent to your offices that's a readable one paragraph so you understand
29 these. Those summaries will be --because I know you're busy, I know, and you've got a lot
30 of things going on. So the idea is to boil down, here's 42 pages in one paragraph. This is
31 what it did. This is what it's saying. We will have those compiled as part of the County
32 Attorney's monthly summaries so those are going to you, so that the MFP and the Council
33 has a greater knowledge of how those funds are being spent. And I have had
34 conversations both with the County Attorney's Office and with our outside counsel as to
35 the direction that the County wants. There were, I think, several times in which, because

May 4 2009



1 the cable office, in the past year, was sort of--kind of keeping things in a holding pattern, I
2 think you will see a change.

3
4 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

5 No, I appreciate that. We're really excited you're here, Mitsi, because I--we can all feel
6 your passion here at the dais. But--

7
8 MITSUKO HERRERA:

9 And let me just sort of add that--

10
11 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

12 So you're saying you really need--you're going to spend down that whole \$310,000 on--on
13 people, attorneys.

14
15 MITSUKO HERRERA:

16 I believe we are going to wisely invest it in making...

17
18 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

19 Very good answer, Mitsi.

20
21 MITSUKO HERRERA:

22 ...a compelling case.

23
24 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

25 Very good. Investment.

26
27 MITSUKO HERRERA:

28 And I will say that part of the attraction for me in coming here is that Montgomery County
29 has shown such leadership on these issues. I-- and I think that partnered with our other
30 partners in the national associations, that we have a real opportunity with a White House,
31 an administration, and a Congress that is really committed to fact-based policymaking and
32 is very pro-technology and is really looking at consumers, that this is our opportunity to
33 change those laws that are not benefitting consumers.

34
35 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

May 4 2009



1 OK. My final question has to do with your Budget Analyst II position. For a department
2 with, what, 11 staff, you need to have your own budget analyst?

3
4 MITSUKO HERRERA:

5 And to that I would say first, what is in the 11 is split between the production engineering,
6 so that on the production side, Donna Keating is an Executive producer for CCM. We
7 have a couple of engineers, we have a Web person, and so that's part of it. Within the
8 budget--this is a complex budget. We have funding from, really, six different sources. We
9 have--we pay out funds to at least four County-funded entities plus a variety of
10 subprograms plus our subcontractors that we're-- that we're operating. There are many
11 things that, now having gone through this budget cycle without a budget Analyst-- there
12 are many things which I've uncovered, and they're complex, and part of what I would like
13 to do is work on over the next year is changing the layout for some of these that make the
14 display more transparent. There were a lot of cases in which I uncovered that we did
15 things the long ways because that's how we had done them before. But there is--there are
16 a lot of opportunities in there, but they will require significant attention to the budget
17 because of the way that the budget functions, because of the way, for a variety of financial
18 reasons, things are calculated, and it would be very difficult for me to be able to manage
19 this without a budget analyst. And I would say as a joke--I've been saying to my staff, you
20 know, that I'm not even married. I'm going to be divorced because I can't keep staying
21 until 10, 11, 2 AM, trying to run through the various budget numbers and uncover those,
22 and I need the staff, if we're going to make some progress in this area. That's what a
23 budget analyst-- I do get support from DTS, but the budget--the cable fund has always
24 been a complex and complicated item. STEVE EMANUEL:

25 And to add to that, it's not budget for 11 people. It's budget for the entire cable franchising
26 process, which includes all of our PEG partners and the budget allocations. It is the record
27 keeping that goes through with all the procurements and other opportunities that we've
28 done as an enterprise process. So it's not about 11 people. It's really about a significant
29 dollar and the various ways we have to spend the money.

30
31 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

32 OK. And how long has it been vacant? STEVE EMANUEL:
33 It's actually--

34
35 MITSUKO HERRERA:

May 4 2009



1 It only has been vacant since December.

2
3 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:
4 Right.

5
6 MITSUKO HERRERA:
7 And as a budget-cutting measure, we opted to have it lapse until July 1.

8
9 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:
10 I have information that it has been vacant longer than that, so I'm just trying to find out.

11
12 MITSUKO HERRERA:
13 Amy Wilson was the budget analyst, and she took a job in OMB. Prior to that, the Cable
14 Administrator position had been vacant since the passing of Jane Lawton.

15
16 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:
17 Right. OK. Thank you very much.

18
19 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
20 Thank you for, I thought, very compelling answers. I really thought--good questions and
21 good answers. Really appreciate the excellent work you're doing and the hard work you're
22 putting in. Thank you. Councilmember Trachtenberg, and then Councilmember Elrich.

23
24 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:
25 Yeah, I actually want to thank you as well, Mitsi, and I think it's very clear from the
26 responses you provided that you wear many hats, that there are many challenges, and
27 some of those are definitely on the federal level, and certainly the ongoing discussions on
28 right-of-way management is a real hot-button issue, and I suspect in the next year or so,
29 we're going to see more heated debate about that and some decisions coming down the
30 pike. And I think it would be appropriate to recognize your effort the last few months since
31 you've been with us, and I also want to recognize the significant role that Councilmember
32 Praisner, that Marilyn Praisner played in all of this. She was a real leader, not just here in
33 the state on these issues, but really nationally. And I can recall how she aggressively tried
34 to bring me up to date, up to speed, on some--much of this when I first took over as chair
35 of MFP, and a lot of the reading that she provided to me, the reading material, I have to

May 4 2009



1 admit, I'm only about halfway through it. So I'm hoping that I'll finish it and complete my
2 assignment by the time this first term is up. But I really wanted to acknowledge Marilyn's
3 contribution in this area and also thank you for your leadership, because whenever I pick
4 up the phone and have a question for you, you always have the answer--and I might add, I
5 don't usually have to wait for it, either.

6
7 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

8 Thank you. Well said. Councilmember Elrich.
9

10 COUNCILMEMBER ELRICH:

11 I'm also really glad to see you sitting over there. Your attitude is excellent, and I think you'll
12 come in very handy when we get around to renegotiating the cable contracts, as well. I
13 had a question, though, going back to when I served as a municipal official, and that is,
14 there was a time when the municipalities were sharing in the cost of legal expenses for the
15 very things you're talking about-- at that point, just fighting battles against takeaways,
16 either the legislative or the-- on the Hill. And I'm wondering whether the attorneys we're
17 retaining from the outside for this purpose, are they--is the cost of that still being shared by
18 the municipalities, which have an equal interest, I think, in getting this resolved?
19

20 MITSUKO HERRERA:

21 There is a cost sharing. It happens up front. The franchise fees that are paid to the
22 municipalities, a percentage of that is retained by the County, and then the fees are
23 distributed, and within that, that is what funds the general activities of the-- both the
24 outside counsel and my staff.
25

26 COUNCILMEMBER ELRICH:

27 Ah. So we've gone from asking for money to just taking the money.
28

29 MITSUKO HERRERA:

30 That is one way of stating it.
31

32 COUNCILMEMBER ELRICH:

33 It's-- it's not a bad way. I just wanted--I just wanted to be clear on the process. Thank you.
34

35 MITSUKO HERRERA:

May 4 2009



1 I would actually, though, just use that opportunity to point out to you that those municipal
2 fund payments--this is part of the complexity of the--of the process--those payments are
3 part of the cable fund expenditures, but we have no discretion. If you live in Rockville, the
4 fee goes to Comcast. The County--the check comes to the County, the County pays it
5 back to Rockville. Those municipal expenditures represent almost 10% of the cable fund
6 budget that the Executive submitted, and if you subtract out those payments, the total
7 funding for the cable fund this year actually went down 6.3%. I know that there was
8 discussion made about the fact that there weren't cuts made to the PEG entities, and that
9 was really because we tried as hard as we could to be strategic about those cuts. In the
10 PEG entities, 77%, 78% of their funding covers salaried staff positions. So we tried to cut
11 where we could-- one-time costs, single contracts, purchasing less programming where it
12 could be. So I just would note my objection to stating that--I understand the MFP made
13 very tough choices, and I appreciate their leadership on that, but in those areas, the cable
14 fund overall did take a 6.3% reduction, and we strategically tried to spare cutting staff. And
15 in addition, because the schools saw an 11% reduction, MCPS--or, I'm sorry, Montgomery
16 College saw a 3% reduction in funds outside the cable fund, and MCT had no increase,
17 even though, as a non-county agency, all of their utility--rent--all those things went up.

18
19 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

20 OK. Thank you. And I don't see any other questions on this budget, so we're going to
21 accept that, and we have one more item for the morning, and I think we can--or afternoon
22 now--I think we can wrap it up, and that's the--thank you--the CIP amendment on
23 Integrated Justice Information System, IJIS. MFP and Public Safety committees met jointly
24 on this. I think we have a couple of folks here for this, but I will just say, as chair of the
25 Public Safety Committee, that the Integrated Justice Information System is one of the
26 County's great success stories. Terrific work has been done, collaborative work between
27 our public safety agencies on this, and it continues to move forward. The CIP amendment
28 would continue to allow that to happen. All of the agencies involved in this collaborative
29 project have put their needs secondary to the needs of the whole. This has been going on
30 for years. We have received, over the years, significant federal funding for this, and the
31 amount that is in the CIP amendment would allow this project to continue. And Council
32 staff, Dr. Torgas, noted "the Governance structure for this multi-agency effort is very
33 collaborative, ensures good progress" and recommended the funding, and the committees
34 concurred. So if there are no objections, we will recommend that, as well. And there--I

May 4 2009



- 1 don't see any objection, so that is recommended. Thank you all very much, and we will
- 2 see you again soon.
- 3

May 4 2009



TRANSCRIPT
May 4, 2009

MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL

PRESENT

Council President Phil Andrews

Council Vice President Roger Berliner

Councilmember Marc Elrich

Councilmember Nancy Floreen

Councilmember Duchy Trachtenberg

Councilmember Valerie Ervin

Councilmember Mike Knapp

Councilmember George Leventhal

May 4 2009



1 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

2 [Indistinct] We have Park and Planning on the agenda for the afternoon, and I will turn the
3 floor over to Councilmember Knapp, the chairman of the Planning, Housing, and
4 Economic Development Committee, who will take us through the packets, no doubt aided
5 by our able staff Marlene Michaelson.

6
7 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

8 No doubt aided. Thank you, Mr. President.
9

10 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

11 And by the people at the table, too.
12

13 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

14 Thank you, Mr. President. Before we get underway, I just wanted to see if the chair has
15 any remarks he'd like to make.
16

17 CHAIR:????? Nope.
18

19 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

20 OK. Very good. That was easy. Ms. Michaelson, do others have this or not? OK. You want
21 to just pass that along so people can follow along? This is our work session on the
22 Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission FY10 operating budget.
23 Obviously, there are a variety of issues, first of which I will address. If you look at page 2
24 in your packet, our compensation issues, generally those issues go to the MFP
25 Committee. MFP Committee has made recommendations which generally go through--
26 consistent with the approach taken to all agencies, provide no funding for general wage
27 adjustment or COLAs but provide funding for service increments at a cost of \$933,900.
28 With regard to the projected 3.75% COLA for park police in FY10, reduce the budget by
29 \$212,600, the cost of the COLA, and leave to the Commission the decision as to whether
30 this reduction should be taken and with regard to pre-funding of--funding retiree health
31 benefits or OPEB, support the executive's recommendation on April 20 budget
32 adjustment, which is to reduce those funds down to zero. We still have to wait and see
33 what the Prince George's County Council's thoughts are since that has to be done jointly,
34 and at this point, they have not yet met, but staff is in close contact with Prince George's
35 County staff, and we are hopeful that in--sometime in the very near future, we will either

May 4 2009



1 see whether we're somewhere near the same page or not near the same page, and we
2 can have further conversations. If you look on page 3 at the overview of the tax-supported
3 funds, for FY10, the commission has requested \$111.3 million, excluding ????? service
4 grants and reserves; approximately \$1.2 million above the February spending affordability
5 target, and the county executive recommends funding it \$109 million. If you look at the
6 piece of paper that Ms. Michaelson just handed out, you can actually follow along the
7 various adjustments as have been proposed, both from the executive and the committee
8 recommendations. If you look midway down the page, it talks about the total executive
9 reductions, and if you look at the bottom of the page, it shows the total committee
10 recommended reductions. Flipping to page 4, major changes in the FY10 budget--there
11 really aren't any. It includes no new initiatives other than the initiation of new master plans.
12 They'll replace those that will be completed, and no enhancements of existing programs.
13 And so I appreciate Park and Planning's recognition of the austere budget times in which
14 we're operating and have come forward with a budget that reflects exactly that. The one
15 thing that I think continues to make tremendous progress is the program budgeting that
16 Park and Planning has put together. Unlike some of the conversations we had this
17 morning where we look at county departments where even though something like
18 technology pervades all departments, when we talk about technology serv--department
19 technology services, we focus just on that department. The way Park and Planning is
20 programmed, we look at the--the programs, all of the aspects of what are there, so if we
21 make a--if we make significant additions or reductions, you can see the effect of the
22 funding that we're talking about on the overall programs before Park and Planning
23 Commission's budget, and I think that's very helpful. It's a challenge because it is different
24 than the other budgets, and in fact, when the committee was going through the Parks
25 Department's budget, and trying to compare and contrast that to certain elements of the
26 recreation budget, some of the language even kind of screwed us up because of how we
27 use the programming and how they're structured relative to a more siloed approach the
28 Department of Recreation has, and so I thank Park and Planning for doing that and I
29 would urge Montgomery County Government to continue to look at that as a model and
30 hopefully begin to work toward adoption of it at some point in the not-so-distant future.
31 Administration fund. The total budget request for the administration fund for FY10 is
32 \$28,596,700, representing a \$1.3 million, or 4.7% increase over FY09. The executive
33 recommends \$27.94 million, which is a 654,000--which is \$654,000 less than the agency
34 requests and 2.3% above the approved budget. As it relates to the administration fund,
35 there have been concerns as to duplications of efforts and how things get charged

May 4 2009



1 between the 2 counties, and so Prince George's County and Montgomery County have
2 asked to actually look at a study of the administration fund to see how that is structured
3 and to make recommendations so we can then explore that in the--in the next year so
4 we're in a better position come next budget year to have a better understanding of how
5 the 2 counties operate and what services come out of the administration fund that provide
6 each in an equitable way so that the charges that go to each county are more reflective of
7 the actual services being provided. As we start to walk through. Reductions to meet the
8 executive-recommended funding level. Since the executive-recommended reductions are
9 all linked to compensation and the PHED Committee couldn't make a final
10 recommendation on whether they should be supported until we have some understanding
11 as to the way the MFP recommendations ????? with Prince George's County. And so the
12 MFP Committee's recommendations would require an addition of \$244,000 to the admin
13 fund over what the executive had recommended. But we've more than compensated for
14 that as we move through the rest of the budget, as you will see. For vacancies in lapse,
15 the committee supports the assumed lapse in the Planning Department budget. We don't--
16 we didn't recommend any further lapse at this time within the planning side, but recognize
17 that lapse could be increased if there was a need for further reductions. The committee
18 asked the Planning Department to provide further information on frozen positions by
19 program. As you look at the work program relative to the semi-annual meeting we had
20 with the commission about a month or so ago, what is before us reflects the discussions
21 that we had and the commission will continue to work on several functional master plan
22 amendments including the green infrastructure master plan, countywide water resources
23 plan, housing policy element of the general plan, Purple Line master plan for historic
24 preservation, highway plan update. The only new program is the Purple Line corridor land
25 use plan. Let's see. What else am I missing?

26
27 MARLENE MICHAELSON:

28 Mr. Knapp, if I could just remind the council that when you approve the resolution for Park
29 and Planning, you also approve the work program, so attached to the resolution will be the
30 schedule of master plans, and that will-- they'll get that at resolution time.

31
32 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

33 Right. And our goal there has been to continue to get back on track so that we are are
34 doing 3, roughly 3--3 master plans a year, and as we get to that point, hopefully as the
35 year progresses, we'll be on track to do that. We've got Germantown coming up in the

May 4 2009



1 summer. I know you're working diligently on White Flint and Gaithersburg on kind of
2 parallel tracks, and if one speeds up or slows down, that doesn't necessarily hinder the
3 ability to get the other one, so our goal is that by this time next year, we'll have-- hopefully
4 worked through all 3 of those master plans. And have others on the way. What--what's the
5 master plan that comes up immediately following that?

6
7 MARLENE MICHAELSON:
8 [Indistinct]

9
10 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:
11 Turn up--

12
13 UNKNOWN SPEAKER:
14 Takoma-Langley. Wheaton.

15
16 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:
17 Hold on. Marlene, no, your microphone.

18
19 MARLENE MICHAELSON:
20 All right. Takoma, Kensington, and Wheaton I think are the ones that they had hoped
21 would come to this council before you complete your session, but the timing was kind of
22 tight, as you recall from the semi-annual report, and the Planning Board indicated that
23 they would do what they can to expedite Kensington so that it gets to you and you can
24 finish work on it. I think the fall semi-annual report is gonna be a very good time to sort of
25 check in again on the schedule for the master plans for the remainder of your term so you
26 have a clear understanding of what exactly you will get to.

27
28 ROLLIN STANLEY:
29 If I may--Rollin Stanley, Director of Planning. You'll see the first drafts to be discussed on
30 Kensington and Takoma in the next 3 weeks.

31
32 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:
33 OK. Very good. And--and that'll be important, as everyone knows. Once we get about
34 midway through next year, it is very difficult for the council to undertake any additional big
35 land use initiatives, and so once we get to about June of next year, we're kind of in hiatus

May 4 2009



1 until the election is completed and we come back as a new council. Parking management
2 study. Committee recommendation is placing the study on the reconciliation list and
3 exploring different funding options. This is a conversation that ties into the zoning
4 ordinance rewrite, ties into bus-rapid transit, ties into transit use more broadly, ties into
5 funding for transit. Any number of things as to how our policy on parking ties back into our
6 encouraging transit. And so I think it's important, at least the committee feels it's important,
7 to try and get this moving forward and is looking to accomplish as much as we possibly
8 can in the coming months. Ms. Floreen?

9
10 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

11 Yes. Go ahead.

12
13 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

14 Yes. I just wanted to point out--you'll be hearing this conversation from the T&E report
15 tomorrow that the county is-- is funding its share on this, so it's desirable that the
16 commission be part of that effort.

17
18 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

19 Very much so. Other questions on that? I don't see any. Commissioner's Office. The
20 committee recommendation supports the budget for the Commissioner's Office. MFP
21 Committee recommends limiting funding for COLAs and OPEB as described in the
22 compensation discussion previously. Central administrative services. The committee
23 supported the budget for CAS but recommended freezing any expenditures for
24 information technology or finance systems. The MFP Committee recommends limiting
25 funding for COLAs and OPEB as described previously. The study will take place. Is there
26 anything more we need to add at that point, Ms. Michaelson?

27
28 MARLENE MICHAELSON:

29 Turn to page 10. You'll see the language in italics that--for the study, and it's the same
30 ones that Prince George's County Council staff is sharing with their council that describes
31 the nature of the study.

32
33 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

34 I don't see any questions. Thank you. If people have any questions on the language,
35 please let us know. Then in fleet management, the committee recommends that MNCPPC

May 4 2009



1 prepare a report on the commission's fleet of vehicles in time for the Planning Board to
2 consider during its review of the FY11 budget. A special note here is as you'll recall in the
3 semi-annual report, the commission identified a series of energy reductions that they had
4 taken over the course of the previous year, a significant portion of this which was done
5 through its fleet management, and so we want to continue that assessment. Ms.
6 Bradford?

7
8 MARY BRADFORD:

9 Yes. The Department of Parks. Mary Bradford, Director of Parks. The Department of
10 Parks has already started setting up a work program for fleet management and fleet
11 utilization issues, and so we're underway with that study already.

12
13 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

14 Great. Thank you. And then special revenue funds, the committee recommended
15 supporting an overall decrease in funding of \$245,000. Request that the Planning Board
16 review all special revenue funds during its review of the FY11 budget, make
17 recommendations for those funds which are projected to have negative net revenues or
18 small negative fund balances in FY11. There's a chart on page 12 that walks everyone
19 through the special revenue funds. If you have questions, please don't hesitate to ask. Not
20 yet? All right. And then the committee supported the executive-recommended reduction in
21 special revenue funds of \$245,000 and believes that this can be achieved by freezing
22 vacant positions. The determination of which positions to freeze should be at the
23 discretion of the Planning Department.

24
25 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

26 Questions--any other questions on planning? None.

27
28 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

29 Going to the park fund. The executive recommends funding the park fund at \$81 million.
30 This is a \$1.7 million or 2% less than the MNCPPC request. Changes from FY09 to '10.
31 Again, there are virtually none because of reflecting the current economic conditions.
32 Productivity. The PHED Committee has grappled with this issue of trying to determine
33 how the staffing should be managed for the Parks Department, and while it's still difficult
34 to determine, and believes that formal ????? work should be done, we are getting a fair
35 amount as it relates to the full Smart Parks program, and we are looking forward to

May 4 2009



1 information on that in the coming year as to now finally having all of those pieces coming
2 online, which will allow us, I think, to at least see how resources are currently allocated,
3 and once we see how things are being delivered right now, we can then step back in
4 working with Ms. Bradford and her team to understand how they should be allocated. Just
5 because they are one way doesn't necessarily mean that's the right way, but at least we
6 can capture this current snapshot and make whatever changes we think make sense in
7 the coming year. As it relates to lapse, the committee--majority recommended keeping the
8 Department of Parks lapse at the existing 7.5% rather than decreasing it to 6% at a cost of
9 close to \$900,000. Ms. Floreen opposed this increase in support of the department's
10 request.

11
12 UNKNOWN SPEAKER:
13 OK.

14
15 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:
16 And the committee recommended keeping lapse at FY10 for 7.5 for a savings of
17 \$876,900. Whoop. There we go. You were a little delayed. I was waiting.

18
19 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
20 All right. But she's got it now. Her button's on. OK.

21
22 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:
23 Well, I don't know how much you want to hear from Ms. Bradford on the subject, but you
24 can see it already in condition of parks. You can see way more of it after this rain. But the
25 visible evidence of our community sends a message to everyone, and I'm really
26 concerned about this. It's always an easy cut for the council and it's--we've certainly done
27 it over the years. But it really affects how the parks look and feel, and that will affect--that
28 affects its usage, that affects its value to the community, and that--that sends a real
29 message, I think, to our community at large.

30
31 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
32 OK. OK. Thank you, Councilmember Floreen. Councilmember Ervin.

33
34 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:
35 Are you putting that in the form of some motion?

May 4 2009



1 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

2 I move to...leave the lapse at the 7.5% for Department of Parks.

4 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

5 I think you mean the opposite at the 6% with the...

7 UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

8 Yeah, you want to go to 6%. ?????? 7.5. That would be great...

10 UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

11 The committee's recommendation...

13 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

14 Exactly. Exactly. I stay with the 6% number.

16 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

17 All right, so we have a motion there. Is there any--we're on page--

19 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

20 We're between pages 50 and 60.

22 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

23 Yeah. All right. Do we have any discussion about that? Council Vice President Berliner.

25 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

26 Just clarification. If we were to accept this motion, what is the relationship of this motion, if
27 you will, to the maintenance of the parks? Is there a 1:1 correlation or is this dollar-- are
28 these dollars gonna be used in other ways?

30 MARY BRADFORD:

31 Mr. Vice Chairman, the dollars would be used for parks in general throughout the park
32 fund. The issue with the 6% lapse could also be illustrated by one other factor, which is
33 the issue with the Park Police needing to keep public safety at a certain level. We've
34 already committed, and the public safety committed--public safety committee agreed that
35 we should be able to put 2 more officers starting in January through training so that we

May 4 2009



1 can keep our force up to speed so that parks will remain safe over the coming year and
2 that we will have more sworn officers available. If I am to do that, then the effective lapse
3 actually increases with respect to, say, the maintenance side. So, I would support
4 dropping it down to a 6% level because I believe that increment would be used to put into
5 the park fund for the maintenance and protection of the parks.

6
7 UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

8 Just to--
9

10 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

11 I just--I think it is important that at least from this member's perspective that if we accept
12 Councilmember Floreen's suggestion here that we have some understanding as to how
13 these dollars would be spent or how these--how this personnel would be utilized.

14
15 MARLENE MICHAELSON:

16 I just wanted to clarify the numbers so you understand the implications number-wise.
17 There are currently 73 vacancies in the park fund. With a 7.5% lapse, they can fill 18
18 vacancies. So the level of services greater than it currently is today, with a 6% lapse, they
19 can fill 30 vacancies, so it's an additional 12 staff people, but either way, regardless of
20 which number you pick, even at the PHED Committee's level, it is increased level of
21 service from what they're currently operating on because it would enable them to fill 18
22 vacancies.

23
24 MARY BRADFORD:

25 And the reason that number is as high as it is with vacancies is over the winter months,
26 what we did was we imposed a freeze. So it's artificially high in--and we did that in
27 anticipation of these budget deliberations knowing that it was a very tough year, and we
28 are feeling a lot of pain in a lot of our--our areas, particularly in the horticulture and in
29 some of our landscape crews. As we start getting into the busy season, as the rain starts
30 making everything grow again, we're gonna start filling those positions soon, and so-- as
31 many as we can fill, we can use on the ground.

32
33 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

34 OK. Our next speaker is Councilmember Elrich.
35

May 4 2009



1 COUNCILMEMBER ELRICH:

2 I guess I'm not entirely sure what your response to Roger's question was. Is there a
3 certainty that these positions will go into maintenance, or--because the difference is--the
4 difference is what, 12 positions. Is there a certainty that these 12 positions will go into
5 doing what Roger wants to do, which is maintain the parks and keep them at appropriate
6 level, or could they go anywhere in the department?
7

8 MARY BRADFORD:

9 The way the council has handled lapse is to do it across the park fund and then let the
10 department allocate it as they see fit so that they could fill positions in the divisions that
11 they think are most critical and freeze the positions they think are less critical.
12

13 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

14 I think what we're asking now is for them to give expression to where would they-- where
15 would they do that?
16

17 MARY BRADFORD:

18 You have to look at the range of open positions and make some decision depending on
19 where the workload is. For example, there may be a need in a non-maintenance role with-
20 - for example, in our--our planning unit, to take a look at some of the things we're being
21 asked to do by council in other situations. For example, we're about to go into this study
22 on recreation. I may, in fact, use one of those positions to provide us with some economic
23 analysis so that we don't let other projects drop that we're able to put it onto these tasks
24 that we've been asked. In other cases, I would use them in the field, and there may be
25 some other needs, but Marlene is right--we use it--it's a park fund reduction and we can
26 put it back into the park fund. Obviously, if the council wanted to give us some direction in
27 that regard, you know, we--we would certainly look at that, but--but essentially, I can use
28 them anywhere I want to within the park fund.
29

30 COUNCILMEMBER ELRICH:

31 I guess I--I'd like to consider giving some direction, then, because Ms. Floreen's
32 comments were about what people were going to see and experience in the parks, and
33 Roger's comments were about what people are gonna see and feel, and if we allow them
34 to fill an additional 13 or 12 positions, and it has no effect on what people see and feel in
35 the parks, then we will have said one thing and delivered-- not necessarily what we said

May 4 2009



1 we were gonna deliver. So if the intention is to actually make sure that this looks better
2 and comes out better, then we ought to specify that's what we want to be put in spec.

3
4 MARY BRADFORD:

5 Well, right now, most of our vacancies are in-- in maintenance. We're down people in both
6 our northern and southern regions. So they're the ones who are really waiting to have
7 those positions filled.

8
9 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

10 I will just say I appreciate the concerns that Ms. Floreen has raised and that others have
11 raised. Clearly, the majority of the committee was not looking to not have parks put
12 together well. Obviously, we're very keen on making sure that happens. I guess the
13 concern that we had was given the economic climate that we're facing, to fill an additional
14 12 positions to be--be in a situation next year to potentially have to reduce an additional
15 12 positions. That didn't seem to make a whole lot of sense. And so at this point, I guess--
16 I don't think-- I'm speaking for Mr. Elrich-- I'm not sure that either of us necessarily took
17 this reduction lightly, but if the council would be so inclined, I would suggest we put this
18 back in increments on the reconciliation list so that we can look at that as appropriate as
19 we move through the whole reconciliation process as opposed to one big chunk.

20
21 MARLENE MICHAELSON:

22 If I could just add, too, if you look at circle 26, it shows you the historical vacancy rate in
23 the Parks Department, and one of the main reasons, I believe, that the committee chose
24 to keep the lapse at 7.5% is historically it's been very hard for the department to keep its
25 vacancy less than that, and if you look historically, and this is over quarters for the past 3
26 years, so September 2006, 8.6%. December 2006, 8.9%. March 2007, 7.4%. In June,
27 they actually got it down to 6.11%, and that's the only time they've ever at least--not only
28 in these years, but historically for years beyond that, for the most part, their vacancy rate
29 has been in the 7% to 9% range. So the committee's number actually mirrors the reality of
30 what their hiring practices have been.

31
32 MARY BRADFORD:

33 We could get into a discussion of, you know, what vacancy rate is and what lapse rate is,
34 because they're not necessarily the same thing, but my default position is always to put
35 them in the field. I mean, those of you know me know that one of the sayings I have on my

May 4 2009



1 wall is "If it doesn't happen in the field, it doesn't happen." And you'd have to get the boots
2 on the ground, it seems to me, to have any real effect on what happens in the parks.
3 Some of those vacancies-- I just want to make it clear that those are also vacancy rates
4 across the department, the ones that Marlene cites, and some of our divisions, particularly
5 some of our--our working divisions that are on the ground, the maintenance divisions,
6 actually got lower than that. If you go division by division, they were filling this past year,
7 and now we're having to ask them to hold things as vacancies come up, and--and not fill
8 while we were awaiting the outcome of these discussions. Well, it's kind of a chicken and
9 an egg thing.

10
11 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

12 All right. Councilmember Floreen is next.

13
14 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

15 Thank you. I wanted to point out that, you know, absolutely the committees worked hard
16 on these budgets to--to try--try to find additional savings. But this was an extremely large
17 hit. For Park and--for Parks, it's almost-- if everyone has the spreadsheet, it's \$876,000.
18 Half--and the committee has recommended in addition to the county executive--well, help
19 me out, Marlene. The committee has--the PHED Committee recommended \$1.6 million
20 over and above what the county executive proposed, correct?

21
22 MARLENE MICHAELSON:

23 Right, and in the park--

24
25 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

26 And I'm not sure about how the MFP recommendations fit within there.

27
28 MARLENE MICHAELSON:

29 The total impact of the committee's recommendations are about \$450,000 of additional
30 reductions beyond what the executive recommended. In the administration fund, the
31 committee recommended more than the executive. In the parks fund, it was less, but the
32 net impact of all of the changes was about a \$450,000 difference, and you can--that's
33 comparing the \$4.55 million to the \$5 million on the right-hand column.

34
35 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

May 4 2009



1 OK. OK. Yeah.

2
3 UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

4 [Indistinct] Marlene [indistinct]

5
6 MARLENE MICHAELSON:

7 This is a summary handout that was--yeah, that was a one-page chart that was put at
8 your desk.

9
10 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

11 Yes.

12
13 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

14 So, I mean--but I would suggest that what Mike proposed as going to the reconciliation
15 list, it's a question of what's on the reconciliation list. I--I disagree with putting it on the
16 reconciliation list. This is the time at which that--that recommendation is either endorsed
17 by the full council or not, and that--that's one approach, to take it down in increments. I
18 don't think we should even go to that for-- for parks.

19
20 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

21 Thank you. Councilmember Trachtenberg.

22
23 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

24 Thank you, President Andrews. I just wanted to point out for my colleagues on the
25 summary of adjustments, which Councilmember Knapp had handed out to all of us. If you
26 look in the middle section of that chart, you can see what the MFP recommendations were
27 in terms of reductions, and there's over \$3 million in terms of reductions, and a good
28 portion of them are specific to OPEB, and obviously, the \$847,900 that's listed there is for
29 the elimination of the COLA. So it's about \$3 million worth of reductions.

30
31 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

32 OK. Thanks. All right. So we have a--a motion. I believe--did we have a motion? I thought
33 we had one.

34
35 UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

May 4 2009



1 A motion was made to put it all in one lump sum.
2
3 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
4 Yeah.
5
6 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:
7 Yes. That was my motion.
8
9 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:
10 It was proposed by the chair to try and do it in increments. The--the maker of the motion
11 didn't like that approach, so apparently we still have a motion before us to put it in one
12 lump sum.
13
14 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
15 Right. OK. And that was-- was that seconded by anybody? It was seconded by
16 Councilmember Ervin. OK. All those in favor of putting that amount on the reconciliation
17 list, please raise your hand. I'm sorry.
18
19 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:
20 Sorry. I thought Councilmember Floreen's motion was to put it back in the budget, not on
21 the reconciliation list, but--
22
23 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
24 OK. Sorry.
25
26 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:
27 It wasn't--
28
29 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
30 All right.
31
32 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:
33 Yeah.
34
35 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

May 4 2009



1 All right. OK.
2
3 UNKNOWN SPEAKER:
4 [Indistinct]
5
6 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
7 All right. Just so it's clear, I-- I'm gonna vote against the motion. Very good. Ha ha ha! I
8 was calling--it's early. It's early.
9
10 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:
11 It's only the first day.
12
13 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
14 I was doing the "no"s first. All right, all those in favor of Councilmember Floreen's motion
15 to restore it, raise your hand. That's Councilmember Floreen.
16
17 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:
18 I'm by myself.
19
20 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
21 All right. OK. Try another one?
22
23 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:
24 Try again?
25
26 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:
27 Well, let me propose--well, if it's-- it had to go out to try to put it back.
28
29 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
30 It is out, yeah. It's out.
31
32 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:
33 Well, now it's out.
34
35 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

May 4 2009



1 It is out.
2
3 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:
4 Clearly.
5
6 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
7 It is out. The committee--
8
9 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:
10 The committee recommendation was to keep it out. Well, then, I support the chair's
11 recommendation to put it back in 3?
12
13 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
14 I would do 3 increments.
15
16 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:
17 3 increments of appropriate numbers, then.
18
19 MARLENE MICHAELSON:
20 So, just can we clarify on the reconciliation list 3 equal increments to get it back--
21
22 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:
23 The 6, yeah.
24
25 MARLENE MICHAELSON:
26 To restore this funding, yeah.
27
28 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:
29 \$300,000 for--
30
31 MARLENE MICHAELSON:
32 Approximately 300,000. OK.
33
34 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

May 4 2009



1 300,000. OK. All right. So, all those in favor of putting it on in 3 increments on the
2 reconciliation list, please raise your hand. That's Councilmember Elrich, Councilmember
3 Floreen, Council Vice President Berliner, Councilmember Knapp, Councilmember Ervin.
4 Opposed? Councilmember Leventhal, myself, Councilmember Trachtenberg. So it's on
5 the reconciliation list in 3 increments. OK. Thank you.

6
7 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

8 OK. We now move ahead to page 16--new divisions. The head of parks had identified the
9 creation of 2 new divisions for this year and walked us through her thinking as she's trying
10 to kind of reshape and restructure the organization. Staff had expressed concern, I think--
11 some of the committee members as well--to try not to expand that too much. It's gone
12 from 8 to 12 over the last couple years, and we're going to continue to work with the
13 department and as a committee to look at the number of divisions, the appropriate number
14 of divisions to get all the things done that need to get done. But certainly as the
15 management on the ground is looking to try and do the job, they're seeing how they need
16 to do it most effectively, and so we'll continue to have a close dialogue on that point.

17
18 MARY BRADFORD:

19 That's correct. And for the benefit of those who weren't in the PHED committee,
20 essentially there were a whole lot of independent offices-- various offices with different
21 titles all reporting directly to the director. I just basically consolidated them in a couple of
22 places, and it's part of a long-term look at how the department is organized.

23
24 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

25 And if you look on pages 18 and 19, you can see how the actual park programs are
26 broken out by department or by program. And you can follow along number of work years
27 attached to each.

28
29 MARY BRADFORD:

30 And I will also clarify for the remaining members of the Council who were not at the PHED
31 committee session that by "program" here, we don't mean programs such as a program
32 you attend. It's really a work element. And, in fact, to the extent that that's confusing, we're
33 certainly willing to talk about--these are work elements, much like a master plan or some
34 other work element would be on the planning budget. These are things that require time
35 and effort.

May 4 2009



1 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

2 No, I thank you for raising that. We had a fairly lengthy discussion as we talked about
3 programs versus work elements, because of the OLO report and Department of
4 Recreation--

5
6 MARY BRADFORD:

7 They use the word "programming", I think.
8

9 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

10 Right. So we're trying to get a standard definition of activities. And so we're working on
11 that, and we'll be doing so as the Department of Rec and Parks reorganizations go
12 forward. Turning to page 20. Potential reductions. Executive recommended reductions.
13 Since the Executive recommended reductions are all linked to compensation, the PHED
14 committee couldn't make a final recommendation on whether they should be supported.
15 Obviously, we've talked about what the MFP committee's recommendations were, and
16 that's in the spreadsheet that everyone has. Um...if you look at the recommended and
17 nonrecommended park reductions, the committee supports each of the MNCPPC
18 recommended reductions that appear over on page 21 related to decreased risk
19 management, utility, and rental cost. The committee does not support any of the
20 nonrecommended reductions and recommends further work on the park activity buildings
21 as described over on page 22. Mr. Berliner.
22

23 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

24 I just want to thank the committee for their identification of these activity buildings as
25 something that is so terribly important to our community. I know that the parks department
26 themselves have come to a greater appreciation for how important they are. They have
27 become sort of, if you will, almost icons in these communities. They are places where
28 people gather, and they are very important to these communities. And even though they
29 are not "cost effective", in many cases they are nonetheless very important. And it is part
30 of the price I think we pay for having a large county. And I'm grateful that the committee
31 has recognized that this is not a place where we can go and, in fact, where we need to
32 invest more not less.
33

34 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

35 Thank you, Mr. Berliner. Councilmember Ervin has a--

May 4 2009



1 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

2 Yeah, I have a question about this. This is 41.5 work years for this park activity buildings.
3 And the study of 29 buildings concluded that there are too many buildings with too much
4 unused time. So the committee's thinking on this was what? Why are we...

5
6 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

7 Which of the committee do you want to ask?

8
9 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

10 OK, I'm trying to figure out why we're moving in this direction.

11
12 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

13 A majority of the committee felt that these were, as Mr. Berliner pointed out, significant
14 parts of our community. And, if anything, efforts should be made to figure out how they
15 could be used more actively. If you look at the top, the recommendation was-- since we've
16 been talking about pre-K services and additional day care facilities, is there a way that
17 these buildings could be used for something like that? Ms. Michaelson had made a
18 recommendation to actually reduce funding for these programs by 25%, which I actually
19 thought was a fairly reasonable approach in light of what was outlined here in the first
20 paragraph, but I was on the minority side of that discussion.

21
22 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

23 OK.

24
25 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

26 But I think that if we are going to continue to have them as the majority recommended, we
27 need to explore very actively program uses that reflect some of the County's current
28 priorities and needs, like day care centers or other activities.

29
30 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

31 OK, so any comments from you, Miss Bradford?

32
33 MARY BRADFORD:

34 My only comment would be you mentioned the 41.5 work years. I want to make it clear,
35 under our program budget, the time of any staff member spent on dealing with these

May 4 2009



1 structures is also included. So it's not just, say, custodial or patrolling or caring for them. It
2 also includes, for example, for this year, the staff time involved in going to the public
3 meetings, meeting with the community, working with planning for alternative structures,
4 and analyzing the structures, trying to figure out what it would take to deal with the
5 situation of those that are, shall we say, in less than optimal condition. So, you will find a
6 variation in what that number is even just by proposing to get rid of them. It's going to take
7 a certain amount of staff time. So I'm not sure that you'd actually get numbers decreased
8 because of the way our program work element budget is set up. I want to make that clear,
9 and I think we did have a discussion about that in PHED as well. So I hope that helps--

10
11 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

12 No, that's helpful. So the committee is going to move forward with having conversations
13 about converting these buildings for alternative uses? So, so far, we don't know what kind
14 of money we're talking about, do we?

15
16 MARLENE MICHAELSON:

17 We have some idea, because the department did an analysis of the cost of bringing these
18 buildings into sort of a usable state. So there will be a significant capital cost. We don't
19 have a dollar amount yet. But I think that's the next step. I don't know if Mr. Reilly?????
20 wants to chime in with some numbers, but the next step would be for them to say how
21 much it would cost to achieve an alternative use.

22
23 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

24 I like the idea. I mean, I know where a lot of these buildings are located, and they're not in
25 very good shape for the most part. And at a time when we're struggling for space for
26 various...you know, reasons, I think it's a good approach, but clearly, until that happens,
27 we're still spending a significant amount of money on these not-very-well-used-- in some
28 cases, not-at-all-used--buildings. So I just wanted to know what the committee's
29 conversation on that was. Thank you.

30
31 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

32 Thank you, Councilmember Ervin. Councilmember Elrich.

33
34 COUNCILMEMBER ELRICH:

May 4 2009



1 From my perspective, I see these buildings as sort of suffering from demolition by neglect.
2 And in the past, they played a pretty important role in the community, and they're going to
3 be really, really seriously missed if they're gone. And the best thing, in my mind, to do with
4 a valuable asset--and having these buildings are valuable assets--is to figure out how to
5 bring them back into use, not just complete the destruction of the assets. And whether, in
6 some cases, it leads to some creative solutions where maybe it's a different building of a
7 slightly different configuration gets erected there, but it still performs an important
8 community function, that's fine. But to proceed on the path of, we neglected them, nobody
9 uses them, I guess we might as well tear them down, is just not where I want to go with
10 this program.

11
12 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
13 Thank you. Councilmember Floreen.

14
15 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:
16 Thanks. And really just to follow up on what Mr. Elrich has just said, I think we realize that
17 they are valuable to communities, but the approach that we've taken so far is, well, we
18 have this deteriorated structure, you know, tell us, instead of aggressively looking at
19 opportunities. And they may not--I think we would collectively agree we don't know the
20 answers. But if we haven't started asking the questions on this in terms of what is
21 particularly useful to a community, I'm certainly one to push the day care center option.
22 Certainly, it's a big issue in some communities that have used these structures for related
23 purposes over the years. Some may fit, some may not, but we won't know unless we
24 really get into it a little bit more thoroughly. So, that's the idea at least.

25
26 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
27 Thank you. Council Vice President Berliner.

28
29 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:
30 Let me just add that there are a number of communities that have stepped forward and
31 said, "We will do cost sharing with you with respect to this. This is important to our
32 community, and we recognize the County's in financial straits and it may not be as high a
33 priority to the County as it is to our neighborhood. And we will put up dollars. We will put
34 up sweat equity. We will work to make this happen." And so, my hope is that parks
35 department will embrace that opportunity to the maximum extent possible so that it does

May 4 2009



1 alleviate some of the costs associated with this but allows communities that are prepared
2 to invest in these structures to do so.

3
4 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

5 I guess a final observation I would make on this point is I don't disagree necessarily with
6 my colleagues who have said, "if these buildings can, in fact, be utilized by other
7 community organizations." And to that end, we've had our Pre-K report, we have had a
8 joint committee-- a joint meeting between Ed and HHS as to child care services and to the
9 extent that staff can reach out to HHS and to Kate Garvey ????? and to those folks who
10 understand that community well and work with the parks staff to make sure that people
11 are aware of it so by the time we get to this point next year, some assessment could have
12 been made, because this has been kind of an ongoing conversation. And if they can be
13 used, then great. Then let's use them. And that doesn't mean they're all utilized by this
14 time next year, but if there's real opportunity. And if there isn't, well, then, we're in a
15 position that we can actually make some decisions in the other direction--not for all of
16 them, but at least for those that kind of begin to lessen this \$5 million burden on our roll--

17
18 MARY BRADFORD:

19 Mr. Chairman, this would bring us full circle, then, to the original study--

20
21 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

22 There you go.

23
24 MARY BRADFORD:

25 which gave you sort of 4 options:
26 either you fix them up or you market them or you transfer them. I think demolish was only
27 one of the options, and transfer was certainly in there. I would point out one thing,
28 because Vice President Berliner we talked about this last year. What you've done here is
29 you're keeping the money in that we currently have, but please remember there was never
30 any additional money put in last year to fix them up, nor is there additional money in it this
31 year to fix them up. So we're not turning a corner here. All we're doing is putting the
32 brakes on, and they continue to slide as a result. So there is no new money in this budget
33 as last year to do the actual work of getting them put back together. So just wanted to
34 make that clear.

May 4 2009



1 COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

2 At least we're not backing up.

3
4 MARY BRADFORD:

5 No, but I don't think conditions are going to improve with them, and it is costing us
6 something to look at them. So we'll weigh it out and see how we might be able to redirect
7 some of that. But it's tough to hold them together with spit glue and duct tape.

8
9 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

10 I think we're just stalled. I think that's where we are. So...OK. Further comments on this?
11 Nope? OK. Professional services. A majority of the committee recommended reducing
12 funding. Actually, the committee unanimously recommended. We just disagreed on the
13 number. A majority recommended reduced professional services by 150,000 and allowed
14 the Department of Parks to determine which contracts to reduce. Councilmember Elrich
15 supported a \$300,000 reduction in professional services. Ball fields. We are continuing to
16 explore whether there is a better way to fund maintenance of school ball fields than with
17 the park tax. We've had some ongoing discussions as to where this should be. Miss
18 Bradford asked that--they would be happy to actually do it, but they would actually like to
19 be compensated for what it is that they're doing and not necessarily have the money
20 coming from their budget. And so, we are trying to explore if there are other ways to do
21 that that will actually continue to provide resources for ball field maintenance and actually
22 get the ball fields maintained-- a conversation, again, which has been ongoing for...8, 9,
23 10, 12 years. So we continue the theme of issues not being resolved but continuing to
24 look for better ways.

25
26 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

27 No questions.

28
29 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

30 Questions? Park fees and revenues.

31
32 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

33 I actually do have a question. So, I know it's been going on for a long time. In reading the
34 packet here, it states the Council has consistently decided not to put funding for this
35 purpose in the MCPS budget. Just curious.

May 4 2009



1 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

2 Every time we have, they've used it for that.

4 MARLENE MICHAELSON:

5 Because any time it was allocated, the board decided to reallocate it to another purpose.
6 So they had allocated approximately 25,000 for maintenance of all the ball fields, which
7 was the equivalent to if there was a hole large enough that it could cause--was a
8 significant safety issue, they would fill it, but they were not doing any other maintenance of
9 their fields. And so after trying to persuade them to spend money on this purpose, the
10 Council probably about 10 years ago decided that the only option was to put money for
11 this in some other location.

13 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

14 Well, that's--Miss Bradford.

16 MARY BRADFORD:

17 These are fields available for the school system for their use. They are not used as park
18 fields. So they are separate from parks. Our only concern was the money to pay for this
19 was coming out of the park tax, money that would otherwise be used to sustain parks,
20 and--

22 MARLENE MICHAELSON:

23 I just want to indicate that when this was first added, it was added to the park budget. It
24 never supplanted any park funds.

26 MARY BRADFORD:

27 Over time, however, it's become sort of part of it.

29 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

30 Yeah.

32 COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

33 Well, I, for one, I'm just really disturbed by this, because clearly the MCPS budget as large
34 as it is and how we keep finding more areas where they have money that we didn't know
35 they had money, it seems to me that because we sign the checks for them over here that

May 4 2009



1 we could use a little bit of leverage to make this happen. So I, for one, as chair of this Ed
2 committee would like to bring this before my committee and try to figure out a way to
3 make this happen. We shouldn't come to budget work session year after year after year
4 after year and say, "well, isn't it a shame that this is something that you have to take care
5 of?" It should be in their budget. So we'll be taking this up in the Ed committee.

6
7 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

8 Yeah, yeah, OK. And this is something that also with ICB and CUPF, there are a number
9 of organizations out there who have expressed interest in actually adopting fields. And I
10 know that that's a program that the parks folks are looking at lots of different alternatives
11 of how to get there from here, but...

12
13 MARY BRADFORD:

14 We do have a few Adopt A Field programs, but they're very few, and we're talking in the
15 neighborhood of 150 school ball fields. It's very difficult to find that many people with the
16 kinds of resources we're talking about here. So we would prefer it in the MCPS budget
17 with a chargeback to us, and we would continue to do it. We're happy to do it. We've got
18 the equipment and the people.

19
20 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

21 OK. Park fees and revenues. The committee recommendation was--does not recommend
22 any change in park fees or revenues at this time but believes an examination of these
23 should be a part of the Department of Rec and Department of Parks study of recreational
24 programming which will take place between now and October. Seeing no questions... The
25 Enterprise fund. This is one of our few economic success stories out there--

26
27 [COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER SPEAKING INDISTINCTLY]

28
29 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

30 Mr. Berliner. Sure.

31
32 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

33 So, the reason why we don't charge a dollar for Brookside Gardens is what?

34
35 MARY BRADFORD:

May 4 2009



1 Are you talking about in the parking lot as an entrance, as a visitor's center?

2
3 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

4 You tell me. I'm looking at the packet, page 24--

5
6 MARLENE MICHAELSON:

7 Yeah, at this point, there's no fee. There's no entrance fee or parking fee.

8
9 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

10 I understand. And it would be wrong to ask our citizens to pay a dollar for this park?

11
12 MARY BRADFORD:

13 We do charge for special events there, and we do charge a fee, for example, for the
14 butterfly show, for the lights at night--

15
16 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

17 It's a great show.

18
19 MARY BRADFORD:

20 Thank you. For the Garden of Lights during the winter, and any number of special events.
21 Having a fee for actually entering the park just to use the park--it is a gated entrance, so
22 one could. I'd have to look into that, but as I understand it from talking to staff on site that
23 one of the deals with the neighborhood around there was they weren't going to do
24 anything that made people park on the neighborhood streets. They have a large parking
25 lot. People will come in. What you don't want to do is create a situation where in order to
26 avoid paying a fee, people will park all around the neighborhood. So you do want to make
27 it easy for people to come in and park in the parking lot there. But that's certainly--I mean,
28 as times get tough, one always looks at lots of different options. And we've had some
29 discussion about parking fees. There's always an unintended consequence of those,
30 particularly when people have other options available to them nearby. People will try to
31 avoid paying the fee.

32
33 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

34 The committee did discuss this, too. And I think as a part of the Department of Recs and
35 Parks discussion, we're trying to look at fees and what are we charging for what as far as

May 4 2009



1 entrance fees and a variety of things. And so, the whole fee concept is something that will
2 be discussed in the coming months. One of the other things we also want to be careful of
3 was not imposing something that sounds good by adding a fairly nominal fee and then
4 having it cost us more to implement the fee by having to have somebody be there full time
5 to actually collect it or do whatever, and so kind of shooting ourselves in the foot without
6 understanding all of the implications. And so, it's the committee's hope that in the next few
7 months, we can actually have some standardized processes and have some
8 recommendations as to this and potentially some other fees that may be worthwhile to
9 implement.

10
11 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

12 Thank you.

13
14 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

15 So back to the Enterprise fund. You can see on page 25 an overview of
16 over/underexpenditures over the last 3 years. And you can see that we are actually
17 making great progress. And I commend the Enterprise fund staff and Ms. Bradford for
18 their efforts over the coming years--over the previous years. The FY10 budget projects
19 overall fund revenue over expenditures of 371,000, that this net gain is based on an
20 assumed subsidy of \$599,000 from the park fund, which is less than last year's subsidy,
21 which is great progress. If you follow through on page 26, as it relates to the subsidy, the
22 committee recommended decreasing the subsidy for the Enterprise fund from the 599,000
23 to--hold on. This is where--

24
25 MARLENE MICHAELSON:

26 Yeah, instead of "to 564", it should say "by 564,000" to a net subsidy of 35,000. And the
27 subsidy would just be for those programs that they thought be subsidized, namely a
28 therapeutic ice skating program and public service events at the event centers. But
29 otherwise, the committee did not support the subsidy and neither did the executive.

30
31 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

32 And effectively, what the impact of that will have will be on the reserve fund. And so they
33 will end up having a reserve fund that is lower than what the target goal would be but
34 doesn't necessarily impact the overall program itself. OK. Questions? OK, no questions.
35 Advance Land Acquisition Revolving Fund. The committee recommendation was

May 4 2009



1 supporting the budget for ALARF as it has been submitted. Property management fund.
2 We also supported the property management fund as submitted.

3
4 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
5 You're on a roll.

6
7 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:
8 I know.

9
10 [MAN SPEAKING INDISTINCTLY]

11
12 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:
13 The committee supports the budget for the internal service fund as submitted, but
14 recommends a freeze in expenditures for any CAS information, technology, or financial
15 systems.

16
17 MARLENE MICHAELSON:
18 If I could just jump in just to make CAS staff happy that this is clear, the committee's
19 recommendation was no funding for any new systems, but was not suggesting that they
20 couldn't fund the maintenance of their existing systems.

21
22 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:
23 Oscar's now breathing a sigh of relief. OK. That concludes the Maryland National Capital
24 Park and Planning Commission FY10 Operating Budget Overview.

25
26 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
27 All right, thank you, Councilmember Knapp.

28
29 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:
30 Thank you. And now we have to turn to the... OK, we got...

31
32 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
33 13. OK. So our next work session is on the ...park police, and Councilmember Knapp, I
34 can describe the public safety committee recommendations and then turn it over to you.

May 4 2009



1 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

2 I think you can probably do most of it, because I think we spent about 30 seconds talking
3 about park police, and it was only in the area of compensation.

4
5 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:
6 OK.

7
8 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:
9 So I defer to the President.

10
11 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

12 All right. And I believe Linda McMillan is here to help. Again, she gave a great description
13 of this at the committee level, but essentially the 2 big issues here are that there are 97
14 authorized positions in park police. There are currently 13 vacancies, which is a high
15 vacancy rate. And it's a vacancy rate of a little over 13%. And there is also a problem with
16 old mobile computers, about 30 or so mobile computers that are 7 or 8 years old and that
17 are no longer reliable and that have needed to be replaced for at least a couple of years
18 and that really cannot wait any longer to be replaced. So the committee looked at those
19 two and essentially recommended a budget that funds the currently filled positions, has
20 the designated amounts you can see for overtime and supplies and materials and other
21 services and charges and concluded that it was necessary this year to find the amount of
22 money needed, about 150,000 to replace those 30 or so mobile computers and that we
23 need to make at least a little headway into reducing the vacancy rate among the police
24 officer positions so that it's not at 13% next year as well. We incorporated the lapse the
25 PHED committee assumed, and the budget then equals essentially the same as what was
26 recommended by the County Executive, if I'm reconstructing that correctly. I'll now ask
27 Linda McMillan if that is accurate. If it's not, please add.

28
29 LINDA McMILLAN:

30 I think it's the request of Park and Planning. I don't know that the County Executive had a
31 specific request related to park police. It's from the agency request. And I would just say
32 that the entire discussion of lapse that you had--and I know that you-- the actions you took
33 related to the reconciliation list will play out throughout this park, because your lapse is
34 across the whole park fund, which makes this a little difficult to pull out as a specific piece
35 and know exactly what lapse is attributed to it. Depending on what happens with the

May 4 2009



1 reconciliation, this would potentially make a difference in lapse in this division within the
2 park fund as well. But I think that the 2 main points from the committee were that they
3 were not looking to cut any existing filled positions and that they wanted to make sure that
4 the ongoing issue related to the replacement of the mobile computers was resolved this
5 year, because they're much older than anything else that we're replacing under the
6 County's schedule.

7
8 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

9 Right. And that essentially was our recommendation. We did hear that there has been an
10 increase in part 1 offenses from 2007- 2008, primarily in robbery and theft. Overall, the
11 committee believes that our park police do an excellent job in helping to keep our parks
12 safe, but it is a very large system. And the number of vacancies concerned us, and we
13 wanted to reduce it at least slightly. So that's the recommendation of our committee, and
14 there is an update on the park rangers in the packet. We've had discussions on that
15 before. There's not really anything new to add, I don't think, in that area. So that's really it
16 for the committee's recommendation on that. I don't see any questions. So, OK.

17
18 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

19 All right.

20
21 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

22 Go with that.

23
24 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

25 Thank you, Chief.

26
27 COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

28 We are not quite done, because we have amendments to the CIP that are Agenda Item
29 14 and the Addendum for 14. The CIP--

30
31 COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

32 These are fairly straightforward. The recommendations as they have come forward are
33 primarily for pulling current revenue out of a series of projects. If you look at Agenda Item
34 14, following through pages 2 into the top of page 3, that is effectively the committee
35 supported these recommendations. There were then 4 recommendations by the Executive

Ha ha! Thank you.